

भारत का राजपत्र The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY
साप्ताहिक
WEEKLY

सं. 11] नई दिल्ली, मार्च 6—मार्च 12, 2011, शनिवार/फाल्गुन 15—फाल्गुन 21, 1932
No. 11] NEW DELHI, MARCH 6—MARCH 12, 2011, SATURDAY/PHALGUNA 15—PHALGUNA 21, 1932

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह पुस्तक संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके
Separate Paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (ii)
PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों (रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) द्वारा जारी किए गए सांविधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं
Statutory Orders and Notifications Issued by the Ministries of the Government of India
(Other than the Ministry of Defence)

कार्मिक, लोक शिकायत तथा पेंशन मंत्रालय
(कार्मिक और प्रशिक्षण विभाग)
नई दिल्ली, 1 मार्च, 2011

क्र.आ. 712.—केंद्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा दण्ड प्रक्रिया संहिता, 1973 (1974 का अधिनियम सं. 2) की धारा 24 की उप-धारा (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए इलाहाबाद, उच्च न्यायालय की लखनऊ बेंच में के.अ.ब्यूरो केस सं. आर.सी. 2(एस)/88-एस. सी.यू.वी./एस.सी. II (सैयद मोदी हत्या संबंधी मामला) में श्री श्रीव चंद्र, वकील को दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापना (के.अ.ब्यूरो) के विशेष लोक अभियोजक के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[फा. सं. 225/20/2010-प की डी-II]

वी. एम. रत्नम्, उप सचिव
MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES
AND PENSIONS

(Department of Personnel and Training)
New Delhi, the 1st March, 2011

S.O. 712.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (8) of Section 24 of the Code of Criminal

Procedure, 1973 (Act No. 2 of 1974), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Shreesh Chandra, Advocate as Special Public Prosecutor of the Delhi Special Police Establishment (Central Bureau of Investigation) in the Lucknow Bench of Allahabad High Court in CBI Case No. RC. 2(S)/1988-SCU.V/SIC.II/New Delhi (Syed Modi Murder Case).

[F.No. 225/20/2010-AVD-II]

V. M. RATHNAM, Dy. Secy.

कार्यालय: मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त

सं. 4/2010-11

जोधपुर, 1 मार्च, 2011

क्र.आ. 713.—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43 वां) की धारा 10(23ग) के खण्ड (vi) के साथ पठित आयकर नियमावली, 1962 के नियम 2 ग ए द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त, जोधपुर एतद्वारा "मऊधर महिला शिक्षण संघ, पोस्ट-विद्यावादी (खीमेल), स्टेशन-रानी, बिना-पाली" को उक्त धारा के प्रयोजनार्थ निर्धारण वर्ष 2011-2012 से आगे तक निम्नलिखित शर्तों के अधीन अनुमोदित करते हैं :-

1. कर निर्धारिती उसकी आय का प्रयोग अथवा उसकी आय का प्रयोग करने के लिए उसका संचयन पूर्णतः तथा अनन्यतः उन उद्देश्यों के लिए करेगा जिनके लिए इसकी स्थापना की गई;
2. कर निर्धारिती उपर्युक्त कर निर्धारण वर्षों से संगत पूर्ववर्ती वर्षों की किसी भी अवधि के दौरान धारा 11 की उपधारा (5) में विनिर्दिष्ट किसी एक अथवा एक से अधिक ढंग अथवा तरीकों से भिन्न तरीकों से उसकी निधि (जेवर-जेवाहिरात, फर्नीचर आदि के रूप में प्राप्त तथा अनुरक्षित स्वैच्छिक अंशदान से भिन्न) का निवेश नहीं करेगा अथवा उसे जमा नहीं करवा सकेगा;
3. यह आदेश किसी ऐसी आय के संबंध में लागू नहीं होगा, जो कि कारोबार से प्राप्त लाभ तथा अभिलाभ हो जब तक ऐसा कारोबार उक्त कर निर्धारिती के उद्देश्यों की प्राप्ति के लिए प्रासंगिक नहीं हो तथा ऐसे कारोबार के संबंध में अलग से लेखा पुस्तिकाएँ नहीं रखी जाती हों;
4. कर निर्धारित आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 के प्रावधानों के अनुसार अपनी आय विवरणी नियमित रूप से आयकर प्राधिकारी के समक्ष फाइल करेगा;
5. विघटन की स्थिति में इसकी अतिरिक्त राशियाँ और परिसंपत्तियाँ समान उद्देश्यों वाले धर्मार्थ संगठन को दे दी जाएगी और उसका कोई भी भाग संस्थान के किसी सदस्य को नहीं दिया जाएगा;
6. यह अधिसूचना तब तक जारी रहेगी जब तक इसे वापस न लिया जाए।

[सं. मु.आ.आ./आ.अ.(तक.)/जोध/2010-11/4944]

दिलीप शिवपुरी, मुख्य आयकर आयुक्त

**OFFICE OF THE CHIEF COMMISSIONER
OF INCOME-TAX**

No. 4/2010-11

Jodhpur, the 1st March, 2011

S.O. 713.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (vi) of section 10(23C) of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) read with rule 2CA of the Income Tax Rules, 1962, I, the Chief Commissioner of Income Tax, Jodhpur hereby approve "MARUDHAR MAHILA SIKSHAN SANGH, POST-VIDHYAWADI (KHIMEL), STATION RANI, DISTT. PALI" for the purpose of the said section for the assessment year 2011-12 onwards, subject to the following conditions:—

1. the assessee will apply its income, or accumulate for application wholly and exclusively to the objects for which it is established;

2. the assessee will not invest or deposit its funds (other than voluntary contribution received and maintained in the form of jewellery, furniture etc.) for any period during the previous years relevant to the assessment years mentioned above otherwise than in anyone or more of the forms or modes specified in sub-section (5) of section 11;
3. this order will not apply in relation to any income being profits and gain of business, unless the business is incidental to the attainment of the objectives of the assessee and separate books of accounts are maintained in respect of such business;
4. the assessee will regularly file its return of income before the income-tax authority in accordance with the provisions of Income-tax Act, 1961;
5. that in the event of dissolution, its surplus and the assets will be given to a charitable organization with similar objectives and no part of the same will go to any of the members of the Institution.
6. This notification will remain in force until it is withdrawn.

[No. CCIT/ITO(Tech.)/Ju/2010-11/4944]

DILEEP SHIVPURI, Chief Commissioner of Income-Tax

वित्त मंत्रालय

(राजस्व विभाग)

(केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड)

नई दिल्ली, 7 मार्च, 2011

का.आ. 714.—सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिए एतद्वारा यह अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि केन्द्र सरकार द्वारा आयकर नियमावली, 1962 (उक्त नियमावली) के नियम 5ग और 5ड के साथ पठित आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (उक्त अधिनियम) की धारा 35 की उप-धारा (1) के खंड (ii) के प्रयोजनार्थ दिनांक 1-4-2003 के आगे से संगठन कर्नाटक स्टेट सेरिकल्चर रिसर्च एंड डवलपमेंट इंस्टीट्यूट, बंगलूर को निम्नलिखित शर्तों के अधीन अनुसंधान कार्यकलापों में अंशतः लगी 'संस्था' की श्रेणी में अनुमोदित किया गया है, अर्थात्:—

- (i) अनुमोदित संगठन को प्रदत्त राशि का उपयोग वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान के लिए किया जाएगा;
- (ii) अनुमोदित संगठन अपने संकाय सदस्यों अथवा अपने नामांकित छात्रों के माध्यम से वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान करेगा;
- (iii) अनुमोदित संगठन वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान के लिए इसके द्वारा प्राप्त राशि के संबंध में अलग खाता बही रखेगा

अनुसंधान करने के लिए प्रयुक्त राशि उसमें दर्शाई गई हो, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 288 की उप-धारा (2) के स्पष्टीकरण में यथा परिभाषित किसी लेखाकार से अपनी खाता-बही की लेखा परीक्षा कराएगा और उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 139 की उप-धारा (1) के अंतर्गत आय विवरणी प्रस्तुत करने की नियत तिथि तक ऐसे लेखाकार द्वारा विधिवत सत्यापित एवं हस्ताक्षरित लेखा परीक्षा रिपोर्ट मामले में क्षेत्राधिकार रखने वाले आयकर आयुक्त अथवा आयकर निदेशक को प्रस्तुत करेगा ;

- (iv) अनुमोदित संगठन वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान के लिए प्राप्त दान तथा प्रयुक्त राशि का अलग विवरण रखेगा और उपर्युक्त लेखा परीक्षा रिपोर्ट के साथ लेखा परीक्षक द्वारा विधिवत सत्यापित ऐसे विवरण की प्रति प्रस्तुत करेगा ।

2. केंद्र सरकार यह अनुमोदन वापस ले लेगी यदि अनुमोदित संगठन :-

- (क) पैराग्राफ 1 के उप-पैराग्राफ (iii) में उल्लिखित अलग बही खाता नहीं रखेगा; अथवा
(ख) पैराग्राफ 1 के उप-पैराग्राफ (iii) में उल्लिखित अपनी लेखा परीक्षा रिपोर्ट प्रस्तुत नहीं करेगा; अथवा
(ग) पैराग्राफ 1 के उप-पैराग्राफ (iv) में उल्लिखित वैज्ञानिक अनुसंधान के लिए प्राप्त एवं प्रयुक्त दान का अपना विवरण प्रस्तुत नहीं करेगा; अथवा
(घ) अपना अनुसंधान कार्य करना बंद कर देगा अथवा इसके अनुसंधान कार्य को जायज नहीं पाया जाएगा; अथवा
(ङ) उक्त नियमावली के नियम 5ग और 5ड के साथ पठित अधिनियम की धारा 35 की उप-धारा (1) के खंड (ii) के प्रावधानों के अनुरूप नहीं होगा तथा उनका पालन नहीं करेगा ।

[अधिसूचना सं. 13/2011/फा. सं. 203/57/2009-आ.क.नि.-II]

अजय गोयल, निदेशक

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Revenue)

(Central Board of Direct Taxes)

New Delhi, the 7th March, 2011

S.O. 714.—It is hereby notified for general information that the organization Karnataka State Sericulture Research and Development Institute, Bangalore has been approved by the Central Government for the purpose of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of Section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (said Act), read with Rules 5C and 5E of the Income-tax Rules, 1962 (said Rules), with effect from 1-4-2003 onwards in the category of 'Institution', partly engaged in research activities subject to the following conditions, namely :—

- (i) The sums paid to the approved organization shall be utilized for scientific research;

(ii) The approved organization shall carry out scientific research through its faculty members or its enrolled students;

(iii) The approved organization shall maintain separate books of accounts in respect of the sums received by it for scientific research, reflect therein the amounts used for carrying out research, get such books audited by an accountant as defined in the explanation to sub-section (2) of Section 288 of the said Act and furnish the report of such audit duly signed and verified by such accountant to the Commissioner of Income-tax or the Director of Income-tax having jurisdiction over the case, by the due date of furnishing the return of income under sub-section (1) of Section 139 of the said Act;

(iv) The approved organization shall maintain a separate statement of donations received and amounts applied for scientific research and a copy of such statement duly certified by the auditor shall accompany the report of audit referred to above.

2. The Central Government shall withdraw the approval if the approved organization :—

- (a) fails to maintain separate books of accounts referred to in sub-paragraph (iii) of paragraph 1; or
(b) fails to furnish its audit report referred to in sub-paragraph (iii) of paragraph 1; or
(c) fails to furnish its statement of the donations received and sums applied for scientific research referred to in sub-paragraph (iv) of paragraph 1; or
(d) ceases to carry on its research activities or its research activities are not found to be genuine; or
(e) ceases to conform to and comply with the provisions of clause (ii) of sub-section (1) of Section 35 of the said Act read with rules 5C and 5E of the said Rules.

[Notification No. 13/2011/F. No. 203/57/2009/ITA-II]

AJAY GOYAL, Director

(वित्तीय सेवाएं विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 8 मार्च, 2011

का.आ. 715.—जीवन बीमा निगम अधिनियम, 1956 (1956 का 31) की धारा 4 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्द्वारा, श्री शशि कान्त शर्मा, सचिव, वित्तीय सेवाएं विभाग

को तत्काल प्रभाव से अगले आदेशों तक, उक्त निगम के सदस्य के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[फा.सं. 14/3/2003-बीमा-IV]

ललित कुमार, निदेशक, (बीमा)

(Department of Financial Services)

New Delhi, the 8th March, 2011

S.O. 715.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 4 of the Life Insurance Corporation Act, 1956 (31 of 1956), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Shashi Kant Sharma, Secretary, Department of Financial Services as Member of the said Corporation with immediate effect till further orders.

[F.No. 14/3/2003-Ins.IV]

LALIT KUMAR, Director (Insurance)

सूचना एवं प्रसारण मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 1 मार्च, 2011

का.आ. 716.—इस मंत्रालय की दिनांक 10-11-2009 की समसंख्यक अधिसूचना के क्रम में और चलचित्र (प्रमाणन) नियम, 1983 के नियम 7 व 8 के साथ पठित चलचित्र अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 37) की धारा 5 की उप-धारा (1) के द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार श्री जे. सुप्रीत मणिकान्तन, ईरानी बिल्डिंग, सेकेंड फ्लोर, आर/25, रामभाऊ भोगले मार्ग, मजगांव, मुंबई-400010 को दो वर्षों की अवधि के लिए या अगले आदेशों तक, इनमें से जो भी पहले हो, केन्द्रीय फिल्म प्रमाणन बोर्ड के मुंबई सलाहकार पैनल के सदस्य के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[फा. सं. 809/7/2009-एफ(सी)]

अमिताभ कुमार, निदेशक (फिल्म)

MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND
BROADCASTING

New Delhi, the 1st March, 2011

S.O. 716.—In continuation of this Ministry's Notification of even number, dated 10-11-2009 and in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 5 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (37 of 1952) read with rules 7 and 8 of the Cinematograph (Certification) Rules, 1983, the Central Government is pleased to appoint Shri J. Supreeth Manikantan, Irani Building, 2nd Floor, R/25, Rambhau Bhogle Marg, Mazgaon, Mumbai-400010 as a member of the Mumbai Advisory panel of the Central Board of Film Certification with immediate effect for a period of two years or until further orders, whichever is earlier.

[F.No. 809/7/2009-F(C)]

AMITABH KUMAR, Director (Films)

उपभोक्ता मामले और सार्वजनिक वितरण मंत्रालय

(उपभोक्ता मामले विभाग)

भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो

नई दिल्ली, 10 फरवरी, 2011

का.आ. 717.—भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो नियम, 1987 के नियम 7 के उपनियम (1) के खंड (ख) के अनुसरण में एतद्वारा अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि जिस भारतीय मानक का विवरण नीचे अनुसूची में दिया गया है, वह रद्द कर दिया गया है, और वापस लिया गया है, ;

अनुसूची

क्रम संख्या	रद्द किये गये मानक की संख्या और वर्ष	भारत के राजपत्र भाग 2, खंड 3, उपखंड (ii) में का.आ. संख्या और तिथि प्रकाशित	टिप्पणी
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1	आई एस 302-2-205: 1994 घरेलू और समान विद्युत साधनों की सुरक्षा: भाग 2 विशेष अपेक्षाएं अनुभाग 205 भाप इस्त्री	1391 और मई, 1995	-

[संदर्भ: ईटी.-32/टी-107]

आर. के. त्रेहन, वैज्ञा. एफ एवं प्रमुख (विद्युत तकनीकी)

MINISTRY OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS, FOOD AND
PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION

(Department of Consumer Affairs)

BUREAU OF INDIAN STANDARDS

New Delhi, the 10th February, 2011

S.O. 717.—In pursuance of the clause (b) of sub-rule (1) of Rule 7 of the Bureau of Indian Standards Rules, it is, hereby notified that the Indian Standards, Particulars of which are mentioned in the Schedule give hereafter, have been cancelled and stand withdrawn.

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	No. & Year of the Indian Standards Cancelled	S.O. No. & Date published in the Gazette of India. Part-II, Section-3, Sub-section (ii)	Remarks
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1	IS 302-2-205:1994 Safety of Household and Similar Electrical Appliances Part 2 Particular Requirement Section 205 Steam irons	1391 & May, 1995	

[Ref. ET-32/T-107]

R. K. TREHAN, Scientist F & Head (Electrotechnical)

नई दिल्ली, 17 फरवरी, 2011

का.आ. 718.—भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो नियम 1987 के नियम 7 के उपनियम (1) के खंड (ख) के अनुसरण में भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो एतद्वारा अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि जिस भारतीय मानकों का विवरण नीचे अनुसूची में दिया गया है, वह रद्द कर दिया गया है और वापसी ले लिए गए हैं ;

अनुसूची

क्रम सं.	रद्द किये गये मानकों की संख्या और वर्ष	भारत के राजपत्र भाग 2, खंड 3, उपखंड (ii) में का.आ. संख्या और तिथि प्रकाशित	टिप्पणी
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1	आई एस 12802:1989	—	—
2	आई एस 12824:1989	—	—

[संदर्भ: ईटी-15/टी-43/टी-44]

आर. के. त्रेहन, वैज्ञा. ई एवं प्रमुख (विद्युत तकनीकी)

New Delhi, the 17th February, 2011

S.O. 718.—In pursuance of the clause (b) of sub-rule (1) of Rule 7 of the Bureau of Indian Standards Rules, 1987 it is, hereby notified that the Indian Standard, Particulars of which are mentioned in the Schedule given hereafter, have been cancelled and stand withdrawn.

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	No. & Year of the Indian Standards published in the Cancelled	S.O. No. & Date of the Gazette of India, Part-II, Section-3, Subsection (ii)	Remarks
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1	IS 12802:1989	—	—
2	IS 12824:1989	—	—

[Ref. ET-15/T-43 & T-44]

R. K. TREHAN, Scientist E & Head (Electrotechnical)

नई दिल्ली, 17 फरवरी, 2011

का.आ. 719.—भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो नियम 1987 के नियम 7 के उपनियम (1) के खंड (ख) के अनुसरण में भारतीय मानक

ब्यूरो एतद्वारा अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि जिन भारतीय मानक का विवरण नीचे अनुसूची में दिया गया है, वह रद्द कर दिया गया है, और वापस ले लिए गए हैं ;

अनुसूची

क्रम सं.	रद्द किये गये मानकों की संख्या और वर्ष	भारत के राजपत्र भाग 2, खंड 3, उपखंड (ii) में का.आ. संख्या और तिथि प्रकाशित	टिप्पणी
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1	आई एस 4691:1985	1425, 19 मई 1990	—
2	आई एस 4722:2001	118, 19 जनवरी 2002	—
3	आई एस 4728:1975	3440, 18 दिसम्बर 2002	—

[संदर्भ: ईटी-15/टी-16/टी-17 एवं टी-18]

आर. के. त्रेहन, वैज्ञा. ई एवं प्रमुख (विद्युत तकनीकी)

New Delhi, the 17th February, 2011

S.O. 719.—In pursuance of the clause (b) of sub-rule (1) of Rule 7 of the Bureau of Indian Standards Rules, it is, hereby notified that the Indian Standards, Particulars of which are mentioned in the Schedule given hereafter, have been cancelled and stand withdrawn.

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	No. & Year of the Indian Standards published in the Cancelled	S.O. No. & Date of the Gazette of India, Part-II, Section-3, Sub-section (ii)	Remarks
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1	IS 4691:1985	1425, 19 May 1990	—
2	IS 4722:2001	118, 19 January 2002	—
3	IS 4728:1975	3440, 18 December 2002	—

[Ref. ET-15/T-16, T-17 & T-18]

R. K. TREHAN, Scientist E & Head (Electrotechnical)

नई दिल्ली, 18 फरवरी, 2011

का.आ. 720.—भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो नियम, 1987 के नियम 7 के उप-नियम (1) के खंड (ख) के अनुसरण में भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो एतद् द्वारा अधिसूचित करता है कि जिस भारतीय मानकों का विवरण नीचे अनुसूची में दिया गया है वे स्थापित हो गये हैं :

अनुसूची

क्रम सं.	स्थापित भारतीय मानक (कों) की संख्या वर्ष और शीर्षक	नये भारतीय मानक द्वारा अतिक्रमित भारतीय मानक अथवा मानकों, यदि कोई हो, की संख्या और वर्ष	स्थापित तिथि
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	आई एस/आईसी 61683 : 1999 प्रकाशवोल्टीय प्रणालियाँ—पॉवर कंडीशनर—दक्षता मापन की विधि	—	28 फरवरी, 2011
2.	आई एस/आईसी 61701 : 1995 प्रकाशवोल्टीय मॉड्यूल का लवण मिस्ट संक्षारण परीक्षण	—	28 फरवरी, 2011
3.	आई एस/आईसी 61724 : 1998 प्रकाशवोल्टीय प्रणाली की कार्यकारिता की मॉनीटरिंग—मापन, आंकड़ा विनियम और विश्लेषण	—	28 फरवरी, 2011
4.	आई एस/आईसी 61829 : 1998 क्रस्टलीन सिलिकॉन प्रकाशवोल्टीय (पी वी) ऐरे—1-V अभिलक्षणों का ऑन साइट मापन	—	28 फरवरी, 2011

इन भारतीय मानकों की प्रतियां भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो, मानक भवन, 9, बहादुर शाह जफर मार्ग, नई दिल्ली-110002, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालयों : नई दिल्ली, कोलकाता, चण्डीगढ़, चेन्नई, मुम्बई तथा शाखा कार्यालयों : अहमदाबाद, बंगलौर, भोपाल, भुवनेश्वर, कोयम्बतूर, गुवाहाटी, हैदराबाद, जयपुर, कानपुर, नागपुर, पटना, पूणे तथा तिरुवनन्तापुरम में बिक्री हेतु उपलब्ध हैं ।

तिथि : 17-2-2011

[संदर्भ : ईटी 28/टी-30, टी-31, टी-33, टी-38]

आर. के. त्रेहन, वैज्ञानिक ई एवं प्रमुख (विद्युत तकनीकी)

New Delhi, the 18th February, 2011

S.O. 720.—In pursuance of clause (b) of sub-rule (1) of Rule (1) of Rule 7 of the Bureau of Indian Standards Rules, 1987, the Bureau of Indian Standards hereby notifies that the Indian Standards, particulars of which are given in the Schedule hereto annexed have been issued :

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	No. & Year of the Indian Standards	No. & Year of the Indian Standards, if any, Superseded by the New Indian Standard	Date of Established
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	IS/IEC 61683 : 1999 Photovoltaic Systems—Powerconditioners—Procedure for Measuring Efficiency	—	28 February, 2011
2.	IS/IEC 61701 : 1995 Salt mist Corrosion Testing (PV) Modules	—	28 February, 2011
3.	IS/IEC 61724 : 1998 Photovoltaic System Performance Monitoring—Guidelines for Measurement, Data Exchange and Analysis	—	28 February, 2011

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
4.	IS/IEC 61829 : 1995 Crystalline Silicon Photovoltaic (PV) Array—On-Site Measurement of I-V Characteristics	—	28 February 2011

Copies of these Standards are available for sale with the Bureau of Indian Standards, Manak Bhavan, 9 Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi-110002 and Regional Offices : New Delhi, Kolkata, Chandigarh, Chennai, Mumbai and also Branch Offices : Ahmedabad, Bangalore, Bhopal, Bhubaneswar, Coimbatore, Guwahati, Hyderabad, Jaipur, Kanpur, Nagpur, Patna, Pune, Thiruvananthapuram.

Date : 18-2-2011

[Ref: ET-28/T-30, T-31, T-33, T-38]

R. K. TREHAN, Scientist-E & Head (Electrotechnical)

नई दिल्ली, 4 मार्च, 2011

का.आ. 721.—भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो नियम, 1987 के नियम 7 के उप-नियम (1) के खंड (ख) के अनुसरण में भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करता है कि जिन भारतीय मानकों का विवरण नीचे अनुसूची में दिया गया है वे स्थापित हो गये हैं :

अनुसूची

क्रम सं.	स्थापित भारतीय मानक (कों) की संख्या वर्ष और शीर्षक	नये भारतीय मानक द्वारा अतिक्रमित भारतीय मानक अथवा मानकों, यदि कोई हो, की संख्या और वर्ष	स्थापित तिथि
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	आईएस/आईएसओ 3411 : 2007 (आई एस 11115 : 1999 का अतिक्रमण) मिट्टी उठाने की मशीनरी—चालक के भौतिक आयाम तथा न्यूनतम चालक स्थान क्षेत्र	आईएस 11115 : 1999/आईएसओ 3411 : 1995 मिट्टी उठाने की मशीनरी—चालक के मानव भौतिक आयाम और चालक के लिए न्यूनतम स्थान क्षेत्र (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	31 अगस्त, 2010
2.	आईएस/आईएसओ 6165 : 2006 आई एस 12138 : 1993 का अतिक्रमण) मिट्टी उठाने की मशीनरी—आधारभूत टाइप— पहचान एवं परिभाषिक शब्दावली तथा परिभाषाएं	आईएस 12138 : 1993/आईएसओ 6165 : 1987 मिट्टी उठाने की मशीनरी—मूल टाइप शब्दावली (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	31 अगस्त, 2010

इस भारतीय मानक की प्रतियां भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो, मानक भवन, 9, बहादुर शाह जफर मार्ग, नई दिल्ली-110002, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालयों : नई दिल्ली, कोलकाता, चण्डीगढ़, चेन्नई, मुम्बई तथा शाखा कार्यालयों : अहमदाबाद, बंगलौर, भोपाल, भुवनेश्वर, कोयम्बतूर, गुवाहाटी, हैदराबाद, जयपुर, कानपुर, नागपुर, पटना, पूणे तथा तिरुवनन्तापुरम में बिक्री हेतु उपलब्ध हैं।

तिथि : 4 मार्च, 2011

[संदर्भ : एम. ई. डी./जी-2 : 1]

सी. के. वैदा, वैज्ञानिक एफ एवं प्रमुख (तक. इंजीनियरिंग)

New Delhi, the 4th March, 2011

S.O. 721.—In pursuance of clause (b) of sub-rule (1) of Rule 7 of the Bureau of Indian Standards Rules, 1987, the Bureau of Indian Standards hereby notifies that the Indian Standards, particulars of which are given in the Schedule hereto annexed have been established on the date indicated against each :

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	No. & Year of the Indian Standards Established	No. & Year of the Indian Standards, if any, Superseded by the New Indian Standard	Date of Established
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	IS/ISO 3411 : 2007 (Superseding IS 11115 : 1999) Earth moving machinery—Physical	IS 11115 : 1999/ISO 3411 : 1995 Earth Moving Machinery—Human	31 August 2010

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	dimensions of operators and minimum operator space envelope	physical dimensions of operators and minimum operator space envelope (Second Revision)	
2.	IS/ISO 6165 : 2006 (Superseding IS 12138 : 1993) Earth moving machinery—Basic type—Identification and terms and definitions	IS 12138 : 1993/ISO 6165 : 1987 Earth Moving Machinery—Basic type—Vocabulary (First Revision)	31 August 2010

Copies of these Standards are available for sale with the Bureau of Indian Standards, Manak Bhavan, 9 Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi-110002 and Regional Offices : New Delhi, Kolkata, Chandigarh, Chennai, Mumbai and also Branch Offices : Ahmedabad, Bangalore, Bhopal, Bhubaneswar, Coimbatore, Guwahati, Hyderabad, Jaipur, Kanpur, Nagpur, Patna, Pune, Thiruvananthapuram.

Date 4-3-2011

[Ref: MED/G-2 : 1]

C. K. VEDA, Scientist-F & Head (Technical Engineering)

नई दिल्ली, 8 मार्च, 2011

का.आ. 722.—भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो नियम, 1987 के नियम 7 के उप-नियम (1) के खंड (ख) के अनुसरण में भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करता है कि नीचे अनुसूची में दिये गये मानक (कों) में संशोधन किया गया/किये गये हैं :

अनुसूची

क्रम सं.	संशोधित भारतीय मानकों की संख्या वर्ष और शीर्षक	संशोधन की संख्या और तिथि	संशोधन लागू होने की तिथि
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	आई एस 14665 (भाग 2/अनुभाग 1) : 2000	1 फरवरी 2011	28 फरवरी 2011
2.	आई एस 14665 (भाग 3/अनुभाग 1) : 2000	1 फरवरी 2011	28 फरवरी 2011
3.	आई एस 14665 (भाग 4/अनुभाग 1) : 2000	1 फरवरी 2011	28 फरवरी 2011
4.	आई एस 14665 (भाग 4/अनुभाग 3) : 2000	2 फरवरी 2011	28 फरवरी 2011
5.	आई एस 14665 (भाग 4/अनुभाग 6) : 2000	3 फरवरी 2011	28 फरवरी 2011

इस भारतीय संशोधन की प्रतियां भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो, मानक भवन, 9, बहादुर शाह जफर मार्ग, नई दिल्ली-110002, क्षेत्रीय कार्यालयों : नई दिल्ली, कोलकाता, चण्डीगढ़, चेन्नई, मुम्बई तथा शाखा कार्यालयों : अहमदाबाद, बंगलौर, भोपाल, भुवनेश्वर, कोयंबटूर, गुवाहाटी, हैदराबाद, जयपुर, कानपुर, नागपुर, पटना, पूणे तथा तिरुवनन्तापुरम में बिक्री हेतु उपलब्ध हैं।

तिथि : 08-03-2011

[संदर्भ : ईटी-25/टी-20, टी-21, टी-27]

आर. के. त्रेहन, वैज्ञानिक ई एवं प्रमुख (विद्युत तकनीकी)

New Delhi, the 8th March, 2011

S.O. 722.—In pursuance of clause (b) of sub-rule (1) of Rule 7 of the Bureau of Indian Standards Rules, 1987, the Bureau of Indian Standards hereby notifies that amendment to the Indian Standards, particulars of which are given in the Schedule hereto annexed have been issued :

SCHEDULE

Sl.No.	No. and year of the Indian Standards	No. and year of the amendment	Date from which the amendment shall have effect
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	IS 14665 (Part 2/Sec 1) : 2000 Electric Traction Lifts Part 2 Code of Practice for Installation, Operation and Maintenance Section 1 Passenger and Goods Lifts	1, February 2011	28 February 2011

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
2.	IS 14665 (Part 3/Sec 1): 2000 Electric Traction Lifts Part 3 Safety Rules Section 1 Passenger and Goods Lifts	1, February 2011	28 February 2011
3.	IS 14665 (Part 4/Sec 3): 2000 Electric Traction Lifts : Part 4 Components, Section 1 Lift Buffers	1, February 2011	28 February 2011
4.	IS 14665 (Part 4/Sec 3): 2001 Electric Traction Lifts : Part 4 Components, Section 3 Lifts Car Frame, Car, Counterweight and Suspension	2, February 2011	28 February 2011
5.	IS 14665 (Part 4/Sec 6): 2000 Electric Traction Lifts Part 4 Components, Section 6 Lift Doors, Locking Devices and Contacts	3, February 2011	28 February 2011

Copies of this amendment are available with the Bureau of Indian Standards, Manak Bhavan, 9, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi-110002 and Regional Offices : New Delhi, Kolkata, Chandigarh, Chennai, Mumbai and also Branch Offices : Ahmedabad, Bangalore, Bhopal, Bhubaneswar, Coimbatore, Guwahati, Hyderabad, Jaipur, Kanpur, Nagpur, Patna, Pune, Thiruvananthapuram.

Date: 08-03-2011

[Ref: ET-25/T-20, T-21, T-27]

R. K. TREHAN, Scientist-E & Head (Electrotechnical)

कोयला मंत्रालय

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 3 मार्च, 2011

का.आ. 723.—कोयला धारक क्षेत्र (अर्जन और विकास) अधिनियम, 1957 (1957 का 20) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 9 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन जारी की गई भारत सरकार के कोयला मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्यांक का. आ. 2181 तारीख 27 अगस्त, 2010 जो भारत के राजपत्र के भाग II, खण्ड 3, उप-खंड (ii), तारीख 4 सितम्बर, 2010 में प्रकाशित होने पर, उक्त अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि और भूमि में या उस पर के सभी अधिकार (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त भूमि कहा गया है) उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन, सभी विल्लिंगों से मुक्त होकर, आत्यंतिक रूप से केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित हो गए थे ;

और, केन्द्रीय सरकार का यह समाधान हो गया है कि साउथ ईस्टर्न कोलफील्ड्स लिमिटेड, सीपत रोड, डाकघर संख्या 60, जिला-बिलासपुर-495006 (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् सरकारी कम्पनी कहा गया है) ऐसे निबंधनों और शर्तों का जो केन्द्रीय सरकार इस निमित्त अधिरोपित करना ठीक समझे, अनुपालन करने के लिए तैयार है ;

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार कोयला धारक क्षेत्र (अर्जन और विकास) अधिनियम, 1957 की धारा 11 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह निदेश देती है कि इस प्रकार निहित उक्त भूमि में और उस पर के सभी अधिकार, तारीख 4 सितम्बर, 2010 से केन्द्रीय सरकार में इस प्रकार निहित बने रहने के स्थान पर, निम्नलिखित निबंधनों, और शर्तों के अधीन रहते हुए, उक्त सरकारी कम्पनी में निहित हो जाएंगे, अर्थात् :-

1. उक्त सरकारी कम्पनी, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंधों के अधीन यथा अवधारित प्रतिकर, ब्याज, नुकसान और वैसी ही मदों की बाबत किए गए सभी संदाशों की केन्द्रीय सरकार को प्रतिपूर्ति करेगी ;
2. उक्त सरकारी कम्पनी द्वारा शर्त (1) के अधीन, केन्द्रीय सरकार को संदेय रकमों का अवधारण करने के प्रयोजन के लिये उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 14 के अधीन एक अधिकरण का गठन किया जाएगा तथा ऐसे किसी अधिकरण और अधिकरण की सहायता करने के लिये नियुक्त व्यक्तियों के संबंधों में उपगत सभी व्यय, उक्त कम्पनी द्वारा वहन किये जाएंगे और इसी प्रकार निहित उक्त में या उस पर के अधिकारों के लिए या उसके संबंध में सभी व्यय भी जैसे अपील आदि सभी विधिक कार्यवाहियों की बाबत, उक्त भूमि सरकारी कम्पनी द्वारा वहन किये जाएंगे ;

3. उक्त सरकारी कम्पनी, केन्द्रीय सरकार या उसके पदधारियों की, ऐसे किसी अन्य व्यय के संबंध में, क्षतिपूर्ति करेगी जो इस प्रकार निहित उक्त भूमि में या उस पर के अधिकारों के बारे में, केन्द्रीय सरकार या उसके पदधारियों द्वारा या उनके विरुद्ध किन्हीं कार्यवाहियों के संबंध में आवश्यक हो ;
4. उक्त सरकारी कम्पनी, केन्द्रीय सरकार के पूर्व अनुमोदन के बिना, उक्त भूमि और भूमि में या उस पर के इस प्रकार निहित अधिकारों को किसी अन्य व्यक्ति को अंतरित करने की शक्ति नहीं होगी ; और
5. उक्त सरकारी कम्पनी, ऐसे निदेशों और शर्तों का, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा, जब कभी आवश्यक हों, उक्त भूमि के विशिष्ट क्षेत्रों के लिये दिए जाएं या अधिरोपित की जाए, पालन करेगी ।

[फा. सं. 43015/17/2008-पीआरआईडब्ल्यू-1]

एस. सी. भट्टिया, निदेशक

MINISTRY OF COAL**ORDER**

New Delhi, the 3rd March, 2011

S.O. 723.—Whereas on the publication of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Coal number S.O. 2181 dated the 27th August, 2010 published in the Gazette of India, Part-II, Section 3, sub-section (ii) dated the 4th September, 2010 issued under sub-section (1) of Section 9 of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, 1957 (20 of 1957) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), the land and all rights in or over such land as described in the Schedule appended to the said notification (hereinafter referred to as the said land) vested absolutely in the Central Government free from all encumbrances under sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the said Act;

And, whereas, the Central Government is satisfied that the South Eastern Coalfields Limited, Seepat Road, Post Box number 60, District-Bilaspur-495006 (hereinafter referred to as the Government Company) is willing to comply with such terms and conditions as the Central Government thinks fit to impose in this behalf;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the power conferred by sub-section (1) of section 11 of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, 1957, the Central Government hereby directs that the said land and all rights in or over such land so vested shall, with effect from the 4th September, 2010, instead of continuing to so vest in the Central Government, shall vest in the Government Company, subject to the following terms and conditions, namely :—

1. The Government Company shall reimburse to the Central Government all payments made in respect of compensation, interest, damages and the like as determined under the provisions of the said Act;
2. A Tribunal shall be constituted under Section 14 of the said Act, for the purpose of determining the amounts payable to the Central Government by the Government Company under condition (1) and all expenditure incurred in connection with any such tribunal and persons appointed to assist the tribunal shall be borne by the Government Company and similarly, all expenditure incurred in respect of all legal proceedings like appeals etc. for or in connection with the rights in or over the said land so vested, shall also be borne by the Government Company;
3. The Government Company shall indemnify the Central Government or its officials against any other expenditure that may be necessary in connection with any proceedings by or against the Central Government or its officials regarding the rights in or over the said land so vested;
4. The Government Company shall have no power to transfer the said land and the rights to any other person without the prior approval of the Central Government; and
5. The Government Company shall abide by such directions and conditions as may be given or imposed by the Central Government for particular areas of the said land as and when necessary.

[F.No. 43015/17/2008-PR1W-1]

S.C. BHATIA, Director

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 3 मार्च, 2011

का.आ. 724.—कोयला धारक क्षेत्र (अर्जन और विकास) अधिनियम, 1957 (1957 का 20) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् 'अधिनियम' कहा गया है) की धारा 9 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन जारी की गई भारत सरकार के कोयला मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या 2181/2010

का.आ. 1935 तारीख 4 अगस्त 2010, जो भारत के राजपत्र, भाग II, खंड 3, उपखंड (ii) तारीख 7 अगस्त, 2010 में प्रकाशित होने पर, उक्त अधिसूचना के संलग्न अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि और भूमि में या उस पर के सभी अधिकार (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त भूमि कहा गया है) उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन सभी विल्लंगमों से मुक्त होकर, आत्यंतिक रूप से केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित हो गए थे;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार का यह समाधान हो गया है कि साउथ ईस्टर्न कोलफील्ड्स लिमिटेड, सीपत रोड, डाकघर संख्या 60, जिला-बिलासपुर-495006 (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् सरकारी कम्पनी कहा गया है), ऐसे निबंधनों और शर्तों का जो केन्द्रीय सरकार इस निमित्त अधिरोपित करना ठीक समझे, अनुपालन करने के लिये तैयार है;

अतः अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 11 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा उदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह निदेश देती है कि उक्त भूमि और उस पर के सभी अधिकार, तारीख 7 अगस्त, 2010 से केन्द्रीय सरकार में इस प्रकार निहित बने रहने के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित निबंधनों और शर्तों के अधीन रहते हुए, उक्त सरकारी कम्पनी में निहित हो जाएंगे, अर्थात् :—

1. उक्त सरकारी कम्पनी, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंधों के अधीन यथा अवधारित प्रतिकर, ब्याज, नुकसान और वैसी ही मदों की बाबत किए गए सभी संदायों की केन्द्रीय सरकार को प्रतिपूर्ति करेगी;

2. उक्त सरकारी कम्पनी द्वारा शर्त (1) के अधीन, केन्द्रीय सरकार को संदेय रकमों का अवधारण करने के प्रयोजन के लिये उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 14 के अधीन एक अधिकरण का गठन किया जाएगा तथा ऐसे किसी अधिकरण और ऐसे अधिकरण की सहायता करने के लिये नियुक्त व्यक्तियों के संबंधों में उपगत सभी व्यय, उक्त कम्पनी द्वारा वहन किये जाएंगे और इसी प्रकार निहित उक्त भूमि में या उस पर के अधिकारों के लिये या उसके संबंध में सभी व्यय भी जैसे अपील आदि सभी विधिक कार्यवाहियों की बाबत, उक्त सरकारी कम्पनी द्वारा वहन किये जाएंगे ;

3. उक्त सरकारी कम्पनी, केन्द्रीय सरकार या उसके पदधारियों की, ऐसे किसी अन्य व्यय के संबंध में, क्षतिपूर्ति करेगी जो इस प्रकार निहित उक्त भूमि में या उस पर के अधिकारों के बारे में, केन्द्रीय सरकार या उसके पदधारियों द्वारा या विरुद्ध किन्हीं कार्यवाहियों के संबंध में आवश्यक हो ;

4. उक्त सरकारी कम्पनी को, केन्द्रीय सरकार के पूर्व अनुमोदन के बिना, उक्त भूमि और किसी अन्य व्यक्ति को अंतरित करने की शक्ति नहीं होगी ; और

5. उक्त सरकारी कम्पनी, ऐसे निदेशों और शर्तों का, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा जब कभी आवश्यक हो, उक्त भूमि के विशिष्ट क्षेत्रों के लिये दिए जाएं या अधिरोपित की जाए, पालन करेगी ।

[फा. सं. 43015/5/2009-पीआरआईडब्ल्यू-1]

एस. सी. भाटिया, निदेशक

ORDER

New Delhi, the 3rd March, 2011

S.O. 724.—Whereas on the publication of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Coal number S.O. 1935 dated the 4th August, 2010 published in the Gazette of India, Part—II Section 3, sub-section (ii) dated the 7th August, 2010 issued under sub-section (1) of Section 9 of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, 1957 (20 of 1957) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), the lands and all rights in or over the land described in the Schedule appended to the said notification (hereinafter referred to as the said land) vested absolutely in the Central Government free from all encumbrances under sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the said Act ;

And, whereas, the Central Government is satisfied that the South Eastern Coalfields Limited, Seepat Road, Post Box number 60, District- Bilaspur- 495006 (hereinafter referred to as the Government Company) is willing to comply with such terms and conditions as the Central Government thinks fit to impose in this behalf ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 11 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby directs that the said land and all rights in or over the such and so vested shall, with effect from the 7th August, 2010, instead of continuing to so vest in the Central Government shall vest in the Government Company, subject to the following terms and conditions, namely:—

1. The Government Company shall reimburse to the Central Government all payments made in respect of compensation interest, damages and the like as determined under the provisions of the said Act;

2. A Tribunal shall be constituted under Section 14 of the said Act, for the purpose of determining the amounts payable to the Central Government by the Government Company under condition (1) and all expenditure incurred in connection with any such Tribunal and persons appointed to assist the Tribunal shall be borne by the Government Company and similarly, all expenditure incurred in respect of all legal proceedings like appeals etc. for or in connection with the rights in or over the said land so vested, shall also be borne by the Government Company ;

3. The Government Company shall indemnify the Central Government or its officials against any other expenditure that may be necessary in connection with any proceedings by or against the Central Government or its officials regarding the rights in or over the said land so vested ;

4. The Government Company shall have no power to transfer the said land and the rights to any other person without the prior approval of the Central Government ; and

5. The Government Company shall abide by such directions and conditions as may be given or imposed by the Central Government for particular areas of the said land as and when necessary.

[F.No. 43015/S/2009-PRIW-I]

S.C. BHATIA, Director

नई दिल्ली, 7 मार्च, 2011

का.आ. 725.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में उल्लिखित परिक्षेत्र की भूमि से कोयला अभिप्राप्त होने की संभावना है ;

अतः, उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित क्षेत्र में अंतर्विष्ट ब्यौरे रेखांक संख्या राजस्व/03/2010, तारीख 12 मई, 2010 का निरीक्षण महा प्रबंधक (भूमि और राजस्व), दरभंगा हाउस, सेंट्रल कोलफील्ड्स लिमिटेड, रांची या महाप्रबंधक, राजरप्पा क्षेत्र या उपायुक्त, रामगढ़ (झारखंड) या मुख्य महाप्रबंधक (खोज प्रभाग), केन्द्रीय खान योजना एवं डिजाइन संस्थान लिमिटेड, गोंडवाना प्लेस कांके रोड, रांची के कार्यालय में या कोयला नियंत्रक, I कार्गोसिल हाउस स्ट्रीट, कोलकाता के कार्यालय में किया जा सकता है ;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार कोयला धारक क्षेत्र (अर्जन और विकास) अधिनियम, 1957 (1957 का 20) की धारा 4 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि से कोयला का पूर्वक्षेपण करने के अपने आशय की सूचना देती है ;

उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति -

- संपूर्ण भूमि या उसके किसी भाग या ऐसी भूमि में या उसके ऊपर किसी अधिकार के अर्जन पर आक्षेप, या
- ऐसी भूमि में या भूमि पर कोई अधिकार या भूमि के प्रतिकर के हित का यदि कोई दावा, या
- खनन पट्टा अर्जन करने के अधीन अधिकारों की पूर्वक्षेपण अनुज्ञप्ति प्रभावहीन हो जाने और भूमि संबंधी सभी नक्शों, चार्टों तथा अन्य दस्तावेजों का परिदान, अयस्कों या अन्य खनिजों के नमूनों का भूमि से संग्रहण और उसका सम्यक् विश्लेषण करने के लिए तथा उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 13 की उप-धारा (7) में निर्दिष्ट कोई अन्य सुसंगत अभिलेखों या सामग्रियों की तैयारी के लिए प्रतिकर,

इस अधिसूचना के राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से नब्बे दिन के भीतर, अधिकारी-इन्चार्ज या विभागाध्यक्ष (भूमि और राजस्व), सेंट्रल कोलफील्ड्स लिमिटेड, दरभंगा हाउस, रांची-834029 (झारखंड) को भेजेगी ।

अनुसूची

कैथा कोयला खनन ब्लॉक

जिला रामगढ़ (झारखंड)

(रेखांक संख्या राजस्व/03/2010, दिनांक 12 मई, 2010)

क्रम सं.	मौजा/ग्राम	थाना	ग्राम/थाना संख्या	जिला का नाम	क्षेत्र हेक्टेयर में (लगभग)	क्षेत्र एकड़ में (लगभग)	टिप्पणियां
1.	रामगढ़	रामगढ़	82	रामगढ़	235.79	582.40	भाग
2.	कैथा	रामगढ़	85	रामगढ़	302.86	748.08	भाग
कुल क्षेत्र:					538.65	1330.48	

कैथा कोयला खनन ब्लॉक का सीमा वर्णन:

क-ख रेखा "क" से आरंभ होती है और ग्राम रामगढ़ और कैथा के भाग से होती हुई बिन्दु "ख" पर मिलती है।

ख-ग रेखा ग्राम कैथा के भाग से होती हुई बिन्दु "ग" पर मिलती है।

ग-क रेखा दामोदर नदी के मध्य से होती हुई आरंभिक बिन्दु "क" पर मिलती है।

[फा.सं. 43015/15/2010-पीआरआईडब्ल्यू-1]

एस.सी. भाटिया, निदेशक

New Delhi, the 7th March, 2011

S.O. 725.—Whereas, it appears to the Central Government that coal is likely to be obtained from the land in the locality described in the Schedule annexed hereto;

And whereas, the Plan bearing number Revenue/03/2010, dated the 12th May, 2010 containing details of the area described in the said Schedule may be inspected at the Office of the General Manager (Land and Revenue), Darbhanga House, Central Coalfields Limited, Ranchi or General Manager, Rajrappa Area or Deputy Commissioner, Ramgarh (Jharkhand) or at the office of the Chief General Manager (Exploration Division), Central Mine Planning and Design Institute Limited, Gondwana Place, Kanke Road, Ranchi or at office of the Coal Controller, 1, Council House Street, Kolkata;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the power conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 4 of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, 1957 (20 of 1957), the Central Government hereby gives notice of its intention to prospect for coal from land described in the said Schedules;

Any persons interested in the land described in the said Schedule may —

- (i) Object to the acquisition of the whole or any part of the land, or of any rights in or over such land, or
- (ii) Claim an interest in compensation if the land or any rights in or over such land, or
- (iii) seek compensation for prospecting licences ceasing to have effect, rights under mining leases being acquired, and deliver all maps, charts and other documents relating to the land, collection from the land of cores or other mineral samples and due analysis thereof and the preparation of any other relevant record or materials referred to in sub-section (7) of Section 13 of the said Act,

To the Officer-in Charge or Head of the Department (Land and Revenue), Central Coalfields Limited, Darbhanga House, Ranchi- 834029 (Jharkhand), within ninety days from the date of publication of this notification in the Official Gazette.

SCHEDULE**Kaitha Coal Mining Block****District- Ramgarh (Jharkhand)**

(Plan bearing number Revenue/03/2010, dated the 12th May, 2010)

Sl. No.	Mauja/Village	Thana	Village/Thana number	Name of District	Area in hectare (approximately)	Area in acre (approximately)	Remarks
1.	Ramgarh	Ramgarh	82	Ramgarh	235.79	582.40	Part
2.	Kaitha	Ramgarh	85	Ramgarh	302.86	748.08	Part
Total Area :					538.65	1330.48	

Boundary Description of Kaitha Coal Mining Block :

- A-B Line start from 'A' passes through part villages of Ramgarh and Kaitha and meets at point 'B'
- B-C Line passes through part village of Kaitha and meets at point 'C'
- C-A Line passes through center line of Damodar river and meets at starting points 'A'

[F. No. 43015/15/2010-PRIW-1]

S.C. BHATIA, Director

पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
नई दिल्ली, 28 फरवरी, 2011		खिरो-जारी	17		00	00
<p>का.आ. 726.—भारत सरकार को लोकहित में यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स रिलाएन्स इंडस्ट्रीज लिमिटेड के आन्ध्र प्रदेश में पूर्वी तट पर ऑनशोर टर्मिनल से देश के विभिन्न हिस्सों में उपभोक्ताओं तक प्राकृतिक गैस के परिवहन के लिए, मैसर्स रिलोजिस्टिक्स इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर लिमिटेड द्वारा काकीनाडा-बासुदेबपुर-हावड़ा पाइपलाइन बिछाई जानी चाहिए;</p> <p>और भारत सरकार को उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि, उस भूमि में, जिसके भीतर उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाई जाने का प्रस्ताव है और जो इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित है, उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाए;</p> <p>अतः, अब, भारत सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उनमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है;</p> <p>कोई व्यक्ति, जो उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध है, उस तारीख से जिसको उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन जारी की गई अधिसूचना की प्रतियां साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती हैं, इक्कीस दिन के भीतर, भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाई जाने के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार के अर्जन के संबंध में श्री भास्कर त्रिपाठी, सक्षम प्राधिकारी, मैसर्स रिलोजिस्टिक्स इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर लिमिटेड, प्रथम मंजिल, फोर्चुन टावर, चन्द्रशेखरपुर, भुवनेश्वर-751023, ओडिशा राज्य को लिखित रूप में आक्षेप भेज सकेगा।</p>			15		00	11
			14		00	00
			12		00	04
			31		00	00
			11		00	07
			8		00	01
			9		00	04
			3		00	01
			4		00	10
			7		00	03
2. सरसुदा			6		00	00
			5		00	00
			525		00	02
			526		00	06
			527		00	01
			533		00	07
			534		00	02
			532		00	09
			549		00	02
			547		00	03
			548		00	06
			545		00	01
			564		00	10
			552		00	00
			565		00	07
			563		00	00
अनुसूची			741		00	03
मंडल/तहसील/तालुक : कोराय जिला : जाजपुर राज्य : ओडिशा			742		00	01
गांव का नाम	सर्वे सं/सब	आर.ओ.यू. अर्जित करने	745		00	02
	डिविजन सं.	के लिए क्षेत्रफल	746		00	05
		हेक्टेयर एयर सि एयर	747		00	04
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	748	00
1. खिरो	79	00	13	53	749	00
	19	00	02	73	751	00
	21	00	06	07	752	00
	20	00	02	80	750	00
	22	00	03	61	760	00
	23	00	00	12	758	00
	18	00	08	94	757	00
					762	00
					763	00

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
सरसुदा-जारी	764	00	00	36	सरसुदा-जारी	1202	00	05	27
	1137	00	01	20		1208	00	07	78
	1136	00	14	40		1211	00	00	91
	1135	00	07	60		1200	00	00	92
	794	00	02	23		1212	00	09	95
	431	00	00	10		1223	00	04	94
	1138	00	09	00		1224	00	00	13
	1134	00	00	43		1222	00	16	68
	1584	00	00	10		1215	00	01	62
	1139	00	05	69		1430	00	03	24
	1140	00	03	22		1221	00	07	22
	1141	00	07	94		1460	00	02	07
	1144	00	09	00		1220	00	00	10
	1145	00	00	25		1461	00	16	04
	1146	00	08	09		1464	00	10	78
	1148	00	00	10		1463	00	13	99
	1147	00	06	99		1503	00	09	47
	1153	00	00	12		1504	00	47	20
	1158	00	00	25		1505	00	34	01
	1157	00	01	67	मंडल/तहसील/तालुक: भंडारी पोखरी, जिला : भद्रक राज्य: ओडिशा				
	1156	00	04	09	1 झुटणा	1	00	92	55
	1155	00	12	00		2978	00	01	23
	1154	00	03	46		5	00	21	47
	1108	00	00	95		6	00	08	97
	1161	00	13	84		7	00	06	05
	1193	00	03	05		10	00	03	22
	1184	00	04	70		9	00	03	56
	1185	00	15	86		32	00	01	11
	1186	00	02	70		33	00	04	58
	1187	00	03	97		31	00	01	08
	1188	00	09	15		29	00	00	10
	1189	00	00	10		35	00	05	49
	1190	00	13	44		30	00	06	08
	1601	00	00	10		39	00	01	64
	1602	00	04	35		40	00	02	60
	1087	00	00	16		42	00	00	52
	1209	00	06	33		41	00	03	88
	1205	00	01	54		45	00	02	30
	1206	00	01	52		46	00	06	79
	1207	00	02	21		47	00	03	53
	1204	00	00	37		48	00	02	76
	1203	00	00	77					

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
झुटणा—जारी	62	00	00	11	झुटणा—जारी	394	00	01	64
	61	00	01	87		402	00	00	10
	50	00	01	24		403	00	01	09
	49	00	02	28		418	00	03	80
	60	00	03	48		458	00	05	39
	59	00	06	37	सर्वे सं. 458 और 459 के बीच में		00	01	92
	166	00	00	72		459	00	00	65
	165	00	01	98		468	00	06	19
	163	00	00	36		461	00	01	48
	67	00	00	40		467	00	07	53
	164	00	04	44		470	00	01	70
	160	00	05	92		466	00	01	30
	159	00	01	45		471	00	02	53
	158	00	09	43		465	00	09	40
	161	00	01	36		473	00	00	97
	157	00	01	06		474	00	06	52
	155	00	00	10		744	00	11	82
	154	00	02	42		743	00	04	43
	153	00	00	31		746	00	02	27
	145	00	12	09		742	00	00	92
	147	00	01	88		748	00	03	51
	148	00	00	84		747	00	02	13
	146	00	11	95		781	00	00	10
	144	00	07	00		749	00	00	61
	194	00	04	23		751	00	01	42
	252	00	02	50		777	00	00	11
	195	00	08	92		753	00	00	86
	205	00	05	85		750	00	03	02
	202	00	00	10		752	00	02	33
	251	00	01	59		754	00	01	54
	207	00	02	21		769	00	00	16
	208	00	01	66		735	00	01	61
	209	00	01	09		755	00	04	47
	206	00	03	50		768	00	03	93
	201	00	00	35		756	00	05	21
	200	00	01	84		757	00	02	27
	210	00	03	87		724	00	00	10
	211	00	01	65		720	00	02	65
	212	00	00	12		722	00	00	10
	198	00	08	94		721	00	00	34
	389	00	07	57		719	00	05	26
	393	00	09	23		718	00	00	45

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
झुटणा-जारी	492	00	00	10	झुटणा-जारी	3077	00	00	10
	672	00	03	31		583	00	05	60
	518	00	00	33		584	00	07	90
	519	00	00	68		612	00	00	44
	523	00	00	73		2988	00	03	71
	4	00	00	42		610	00	01	17
	522	00	01	37		608	00	00	75
	520	00	01	79		611	00	07	18
	521	00	02	27		615	00	01	38
	525	00	02	35		607	00	02	57
	517	00	06	52		616	00	01	47
	516	00	03	06		606	00	01	94
	527	00	01	18		605	00	04	59
	514	00	04	08		604	00	01	93
	513	00	05	27		602	00	01	56
	512	00	00	82		603	00	04	89
	544	00	00	59		598	00	12	30
	546	00	03	78		597	00	08	65
	545	00	03	29	2 बाबलपुर	336	00	00	39
	547	00	01	47		337	00	00	78
	539	00	02	33		396	00	03	52
	548	00	02	84		395	00	03	60
	550	00	00	10		394	00	02	98
	551	00	01	29		393	00	01	11
	559	00	00	41		398	00	01	64
	558	00	00	31		392	00	06	68
	552	00	03	86		399	00	03	86
	557	00	01	19		405	00	03	79
	555	00	01	60		400	00	07	78
	553	00	00	10		404	00	03	56
	554	00	00	28		403	00	03	80
	562	00	00	27		402	00	02	95
	556	00	03	32		401	00	04	74
	563	00	01	13		681	00	09	81
	576	00	01	96		679	00	02	24
	577	00	01	07		678	00	02	20
	578	00	03	60		677	00	00	47
	579	00	02	40	3 बंदालो	1923	00	00	10
	580	00	02	74		2054	00	06	56
	581	00	00	10		2008	00	03	01
	582	00	07	77		2007	00	10	02
	585	00	00	12		2006	00	18	51

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
बंदलो-जारी		1996	00	00	86	देउपदा-जारी		1694	00	00	51
		2002	00	07	09			1695	00	09	62
		1998	00	01	04			1698	00	02	78
		2001	00	02	30			1696	00	00	46
		1999	00	06	46			1697	00	09	18
		2000	00	00	44			1601	00	05	17
		1985	00	11	67			1600	00	07	91
		21	00	01	60			1599	00	06	08
		22	00	04	83			1596	00	04	80
		23	00	01	90			1598	00	00	22
4. देउपदा		1832	00	07	86			1597	00	06	54
		1818	00	01	08			1580	00	01	48
		1820	00	00	10			1581	00	12	49
		1817	00	11	86			1588	00	00	10
		1813	00	04	87			1583	00	07	04
		1816	00	03	17			1582	00	03	86
		1814	00	00	10			1586	00	01	97
		1815	00	01	84			1584	00	06	96
		1826	00	04	16			1562	00	00	49
		1827	00	13	80			1561	00	06	41
		1806	00	00	16			1511	00	06	54
		1805	00	10	16			1552	00	11	44
		1896	00	05	65			1553	00	04	69
		1795	00	03	13			1551	00	07	96
		1794	00	12	04			1550	00	00	20
		1793	00	00	78			1546	00	17	94
		1787	00	03	75			1574	00	04	65
		1789	00	08	75			1547	00	05	43
		1788	00	04	90			2573	00	03	06
		1747	00	04	03			620	00	00	10
		1750	00	03	10			619	00	03	43
		1749	00	14	19			618	00	16	38
		1748	00	03	31			617	00	00	88
		1715	00	04	93			627	00	13	68
		1716	00	01	27			631	00	03	95
		1717	00	12	51			632	00	05	88
		1719	00	00	10			633	00	02	75
		1718	00	00	87			634	00	02	54
		1709	00	03	92			635	00	00	17
		1708	00	07	39			636	00	00	43
		1707	00	03	54			637	00	00	78
								638	00	02	69

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
देउपदा-जारी	736	00	00	19	अगेइ बेहेरा-जारी	637	00	04	52
	640	00	04	95		636	00	03	05
	639	00	05	61		635	00	03	28
	729	00	00	29		632	00	01	04
	726	00	00	02		633	00	09	93
	727	00	12	62		634	00	00	37
	721	00	13	97		606	00	17	61
	720	00	08	27		640	00	03	60
	719	00	06	29		605	00	01	95
	718	00	09	40		659	00	01	73
	715	00	06	70	7. राजेन्द्रपुर	941	00	02	36
	713	00	03	32		942	00	03	18
	2482	00	00	34		943	00	05	35
	2481	00	05	29		953	00	11	27
	714	00	02	37		958	00	00	10
	711	00	03	34		952	00	05	09
	710	00	02	76		947	00	03	85
	712	00	00	10		948	00	11	49
	708	00	04	61		930	00	21	51
	709	00	03	33		937	00	01	70
	705	00	08	34		931	00	04	23
	706	00	02	09		932	00	21	34
	703	00	01	74		929	00	05	86
	778	00	08	37		899	00	02	11
	779	00	07	40		683	00	01	60
	780	00	02	32		684	00	04	01
	781	00	33	25		644	00	00	11
	793	00	09	98		643	00	01	28
	824	00	06	21		706	00	21	24
	825	00	25	03		629	00	04	39
5. मंदर गाडीआ	463	00	02	86		628	00	08	42
	465	00	11	67		626	00	05	25
	458	00	09	39		632	00	08	28
	464	00	07	60		625	00	01	17
सर्वे सं. 464 और 470 के बीच में		00	17	69		633	00	07	39
	470	00	07	15		634	00	00	10
	472	00	05	74		624	00	02	14
	471	00	05	31		635	00	00	10
	473	00	01	14		598	00	09	56
	475	00	04	82		609	00	09	61
6. अगेइ बेहेरा	638	00	12	14		608	00	00	18
	628	00	00	10		610	00	19	33
	684	00	04	75					

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
राजेन्द्रपुर-जारी	607	00	00	10	राजेन्द्रपुर-जारी	139	00	22	80
	611	00	00	69		138	00	01	58
	612	00	00	21		34	00	09	46
	614	00	01	88		33	00	07	91
	615	00	02	60		30	00	04	59
	582	00	06	25		32	00	04	98
	617	00	00	22		31	00	08	12
	581	00	02	69		156	00	00	10
	575	00	02	03		28	00	21	04
	574	00	03	37		165	00	01	22
	570	00	05	12		166	00	04	19
	572	00	01	40		27	00	00	68
	571	00	03	78		26	00	00	10
	561	00	00	66		177	00	00	24
	1110	00	01	76		178	00	00	47
	560	00	06	23		179	00	00	76
	553	00	10	67		180	00	05	31
	1089	00	05	06		181	00	05	59
	550	00	06	48		182	00	02	98
	546	00	02	47		188	00	01	22
	535	00	03	65		189	00	00	68
	527	00	03	96		187	00	03	15
	525	00	05	66		190	00	04	41
	524	00	02	61		194	00	00	12
	526	00	02	95		193	00	01	54
	522	00	00	10		191	00	00	87
	530	00	00	32		195	00	00	77
	521	00	23	27		192	00	01	03
	520	00	03	38		197	00	13	21
	112	00	00	59		198	00	00	46
	113	00	00	10	8. सनासासन	735	00	04	18
	114	00	00	99		736	00	00	10
	115	00	08	80		1210	00	01	64
	128	00	03	60		737	00	12	91
	127	00	04	34		739	00	00	57
	1067	00	00	64		740	00	08	25
	129	00	02	08		742	00	00	63
	126	00	05	80		741	00	01	88
	131	00	00	57		744	00	06	77
	125	00	00	10		745	00	03	55
	132	00	04	92		746	00	09	72
	137	00	00	45		1224	00	08	25

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
सनासासन—जारी	675	00	10	28	मंतागारिया—जारी	535	00	01	85
	674	00	01	43		520	00	00	21
	673	00	06	13		521	00	13	07
	672	00	01	22		619	00	07	02
	670	00	07	24		495	00	00	50
	1226	00	06	20		516	00	12	29
	665	00	02	62		617	00	01	18
	1227	00	03	04		497	00	11	72
	664	00	02	97		500	00	00	21
	663	00	02	16		501	00	02	94
	662	00	00	47		502	00	08	47
	1142	00	11	03		503	00	09	64
	630	00	00	94		599	00	00	30
	1214	00	00	45		488	00	04	95
	656	00	17	86		504	00	07	27
	653	00	00	10		487	00	00	22
	654	00	00	52		476	00	18	99
	655	00	07	11		477	00	02	86
	649	00	09	53		471	00	11	80
	648	00	02	39		469	00	09	45
	646	00	12	87		470	00	04	38
	637	00	04	84		628	00	15	74
	638	00	00	92		452	00	00	15
	639	00	00	54	मंडल/तहसील/तालुक: भद्रक देहात जिला : भद्रक राज्य : ओडिशा				
	1213	00	06	66	1. गंडगारा	253	00	07	11
	641	00	00	74		255	00	00	10
	640	00	09	82		252	00	03	03
9. मंतागारिया	552	00	09	31		73	00	02	43
	260	00	02	10		251	00	03	59
	551	00	12	55		250	00	00	65
	261	00	01	88		249	00	03	39
	543	00	09	39		247	00	01	15
	542	00	02	27		221	00	07	36
	541	00	10	12		222	00	01	09
	540	00	03	28		220	00	03	79
	539	00	02	71		219	00	01	27
	538	00	02	59		218	00	04	85
	537	00	03	08		217	00	03	87
	532	00	07	29		216	00	04	10
	536	00	03	70		228	00	00	24
	533	00	03	02		215	00	01	86
	534	00	04	83		214	00	04	57

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
गंडगरी-जारी	213	00	01	57	गोबिंदपुर-जारी	741	00	00	20
	83	00	01	96		742	00	00	10
	85	00	04	12		744	00	06	06
	84	00	04	52		745	00	00	70
	46	00	08	60		701	00	02	31
	87	00	00	12		752	00	05	87
	88	00	01	19		753	00	05	14
	89	00	01	81		700	00	03	95
	45	00	04	43		754	00	01	07
	90	00	05	23		699	00	00	10
	44	00	01	93		959	00	07	51
	37	00	43	72		755	00	16	46
	111	00	02	99		957	00	02	45
	112	00	02	25		759	00	01	63
	137	00	00	65		958	00	07	65
	113	00	03	83		645	00	02	77
	136	00	01	12		646	00	02	90
	115	00	00	29		648	00	10	90
	114	00	05	39		649	00	10	07
	135	00	02	03		650	00	10	18
	133	00	03	04		653	00	08	33
	134	00	01	21		652	00	12	59
	142	00	02	28		654	00	06	48
	140	00	00	10		655	00	03	86
	141	00	00	30		656	00	04	56
	132	00	01	44		501	00	12	26
	129	00	00	68		503	00	02	53
	131	00	01	47		502	00	09	66
	2182	00	01	74		595	00	00	10
	143	00	02	19		575	00	05	09
2. गोबिंदपुर	257	00	01	48		574	00	02	78
	258	00	02	73		507	00	04	19
	259	00	02	98		506	00	01	37
	714	00	02	10		510	00	00	35
	715	00	02	77		508	00	05	71
	713	00	08	86		573	00	01	64
	717	00	02	40		572	00	01	20
	738	00	02	03		963	00	04	28
	737	00	03	39		509	00	00	09
	739	00	00	58		557	00	05	76
	740	00	10	66		512	00	00	37
	743	00	07	14		556	00	08	17

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
गाबिंदपुर-जारी	513	00	00	33	अंधिआ-जारी	1322	00	10	67
	554	00	01	36		1338	00	00	64
	555	00	06	11		1321	00	00	39
	551	00	00	46		1291	00	12	63
	552	00	09	23		1292	00	06	28
	553	00	01	78		2292	00	07	90
	543	00	18	88		1284	00	08	87
	540	00	09	11		1288	00	07	27
	938	00	11	45		1287	00	05	81
	544	00	00	10		1286	00	05	22
	545	00	03	04		1277	00	01	12
	539	00	07	20		1285	00	04	14
	538	00	00	10		1278	00	05	70
	534	00	11	43		1282	00	00	47
	535	00	00	25		1279	00	12	23
	536	00	16	54		1274	00	00	10
3. अंधिआ	1759	00	01	07		1273	00	02	46
	1736	00	03	82		1272	00	05	69
	1739	00	14	79		1268	00	00	10
	1738	00	23	44		1280	00	00	14
	1388	00	01	70		1271	00	05	98
	1389	00	06	68		1270	00	02	58
	1394	00	00	11		1269	00	10	31
	1392	00	02	06		1246	00	01	79
	1390	00	05	35		1245	00	02	49
	1391	00	07	39		2205	00	00	10
	1401	00	01	08		1241	00	12	88
	1333	00	11	63		1243	00	03	91
	1402	00	00	42		1242	00	12	84
	1332	00	05	68		1199	00	04	26
	1331	00	00	35	4. रघुनाथपुर	320	00	00	53
	1403	00	00	10		1095	00	06	40
	1330	00	12	69		315	00	08	39
	1329	00	06	06		316	00	10	47
	1327	00	00	10		317	00	06	38
	1328	00	07	98		311	00	06	19
	1335	00	03	03		313	00	00	13
	1324	00	02	69		263	00	12	99
	1323	00	11	64		309	00	00	32
	1336	00	00	23		264	00	14	87
	1337	00	05	15		265	00	00	11
	2273	00	00	10		266	00	08	31

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
रघुनाथपुर-जारी	271	00	00	97	तुंडा	802	00	06	09
	267	00	11	73		803	00	12	38
	269	00	03	64		805	00	00	27
	268	00	05	52		806	00	03	76
	128	00	01	45		800	00	00	10
	248	00	01	19		801	00	02	67
	249	00	02	04		498	00	23	11
	247	00	01	37		497	00	02	66
	129	00	05	82		495	00	01	91
	131	00	01	28		843	00	00	10
	246	00	11	77		441	00	05	83
	240	00	00	10		440	00	02	24
	241	00	01	25		439	00	02	92
	133	00	01	58		438	00	03	49
	132	00	01	81		442	00	02	18
	242	00	00	43		443	00	16	19
	245	00	04	15		444	00	05	03
	244	00	00	89		437	00	00	60
	243	00	01	52		445	00	07	55
	134	00	10	03		490	00	05	35
	147	00	00	25		446	00	01	15
	135	00	01	58		448	00	10	03
	137	00	00	10		450	00	00	10
	102	00	10	71		449	00	07	90
	81	00	10	22		465	00	00	47
	82	00	01	44		466	00	09	46
	80	00	05	40		468	00	11	26
	77	00	02	09		485	00	03	06
	79	00	09	75		292	00	00	45
	83	00	00	21		470	00	09	10
	78	00	05	76		471	00	09	57
	50	00	06	05		235	00	02	16
	54	00	21	88		234	00	03	86
	58	00	00	10		233	00	02	35
	51	00	13	40		239	00	03	43
	53	00	02	16		232	00	03	14
	52	00	11	29		228	00	00	10
	39	00	04	77		226	00	00	24
	40	00	04	28		213	00	01	50
	38	00	09	98		231	00	09	24
	37	00	02	63		230	00	00	13
	35	00	12	41		6	00	12	87
	36	00	03	25					

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
तुंडा-जारी	217	00	04	80	नारायणपुर-जारी	113	00	00	10
	255	00	05	51		109	00	03	35
	206	00	09	59		108	00	08	13
	205	00	00	54		115	00	00	10
	207	00	15	56		107	00	07	66
	204	00	01	41		102	00	17	77
	203	00	02	62		81	00	14	23
	202	00	12	01		98	00	01	34
	201	00	08	06		83	00	02	88
6. बेलदा	1017	00	00	10		82	00	00	66
	1090	00	11	30		84	00	10	68
	1031	00	09	27		88	00	00	10
	1035	00	22	55		85	00	00	10
	1030	00	10	96		86	00	04	96
	1029	00	06	15		452	00	07	75
	579	00	02	65		453	00	02	51
	589	00	02	21		87	00	00	10
	590	00	01	70		74	00	11	85
	588	00	04	41		73	00	00	10
	581	00	00	70		41	00	00	82
	582	00	08	78		42	00	20	45
	587	00	04	28		464	00	00	82
	586	00	00	70		43	00	05	31
	585	00	01	84		458	00	03	79
	583	00	10	45		44	00	12	35
	557	00	00	54		27	00	00	49
	584	00	06	13		455	00	03	46
	554	00	11	79		28	00	00	34
	551	00	10	22		450	00	10	97
	553	00	03	64		25	00	00	47
	552	00	05	14		26	00	07	44
	542	00	10	24		50	00	01	90
	543	00	00	95	8. कतिआ	1868	00	00	23
	540	00	00	48		1870	00	01	47
	541	00	06	83		1871	00	02	12
	539	00	02	15		1869	00	00	15
7. नारायणपुर	254	00	00	10		1872	00	06	69
	253	00	05	85		1882	00	00	10
	252	00	07	93		1881	00	01	42
	110	00	07	95		1880	00	01	09
	112	00	01	29		1879	00	01	34
	111	00	03	09		1878	00	02	67

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
कतिआ-जारी	1877	00	00	85	गणीजंगा-जारी	2207	00	04	65
	2618	00	02	82		2208	00	01	07
	2538	00	03	47		2134	00	35	66
	2541	00	05	82		2131	00	02	70
	2542	00	00	98		2130	00	02	08
	2545	00	29	55		2129	00	02	79
	2529	00	08	36		2221	00	00	10
	2527	00	03	91		2128	00	00	10
	2526	00	05	83		2127	00	03	04
	2528	00	01	60		2126	00	10	21
	2525	00	02	53		2125	00	02	25
	2522	00	03	25		2124	00	10	51
	2524	00	11	56		2123	00	07	22
	2515	00	00	23		2121	00	00	15
	2516	00	03	87		2120	00	16	75
	2517	00	02	72	10. कुसुन नगर	2169	00	02	90
	2511	00	20	00		2167	00	06	49
	2510	00	01	16		2166	00	00	34
	2508	00	00	95		2146	00	10	95
	2509	00	08	25		2148	00	02	70
	2505	00	02	37		2142	00	00	98
	2498	00	01	62		2147	00	07	59
	2499	00	04	33		2149	00	00	30
	2497	00	00	10		2141	00	04	34
	2491	00	02	14		1825	00	02	85
	2490	00	08	85		1826	00	05	73
	2489	00	01	86		2139	00	01	80
	2477	00	02	04		1827	00	01	70
	2552	00	05	83		1829	00	02	64
गणीजंगा	2246	00	11	42		1828	00	01	59
	2338	00	07	17		1831	00	00	65
	2245	00	08	91		1830	00	04	15
	2187	00	00	28		1812	00	01	07
	2244	00	13	88		1811	00	03	86
	2201	00	13	19		1809	00	01	68
	2202	00	01	73		1810	00	02	50
	2203	00	02	14		1805	00	00	17
	2204	00	05	16		1804	00	04	96
	2205	00	01	57		1801	00	01	48
	2206	00	06	70		1802	00	07	56
	2210	00	01	83		1803	00	04	02
	2209	00	02	36		1757	00	19	13

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
कुसुन नगर-जारी	2905	00	04	90	कुसुन नगर-जारी	1477	00	05	43
	2814	00	13	13		1476	00	07	43
	2813	00	03	17		1473	00	00	43
	1758	00	07	75		1475	00	07	13
	1759	00	02	21		1474	00	02	53
	1763	00	21	08		1469	00	03	14
	1765	00	00	39		1467	00	03	91
	1766	00	07	78		1468	00	05	66
	1767	00	11	54		1466	00	01	07
	1770	00	00	09		2775	00	01	06
	1768	00	01	07		1463	00	02	45
	1769	00	09	62		1462	00	03	43
	1726	00	03	14		1464	00	00	92
	1725	00	08	10		1461	00	03	72
	1727	00	00	41		1460	00	00	37
	1728	00	00	10		1459	00	00	10
	1722	00	00	10		1453	00	08	17
	1724	00	05	74		1452	00	00	66
	1723	00	01	79		1454	00	02	49
	1557	00	04	44		1270	00	07	50
	2847	00	05	78		1269	00	06	08
	1558	00	11	09		1271	00	08	50
	1544	00	07	49		1253	00	03	41
	1561	00	07	84		1252	00	26	43
	1560	00	00	10		1251	00	05	05
	1541	00	00	10		1250	00	09	45
	1540	00	07	99		1249	00	04	55
	1536	00	04	80		1247	00	01	54
	1535	00	00	10		1248	00	04	47
	1537	00	20	87		1245	00	09	65
	1539	00	00	48		1215	00	04	06
	1538	00	07	34		1214	00	09	62
	1520	00	00	87		1212	00	09	36
	1521	00	20	40		1202	00	17	31
	1514	00	06	58		1200	00	11	34
	1513	00	06	50		999	00	20	58
	1510	00	06	68		998	00	06	99
	1498	00	07	76		997	00	22	84
	1497	00	06	15		996	00	03	97
	1496	00	07	06		995	00	19	41
	1487	00	02	16		2898	00	06	04
	1488	00	04	23		839	00	02	50
	1489	00	06	07		838	00	06	10
						840	00	03	71
						837	00	10	11

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
कुसुन नगर-जारी	789	00	11	16
	793	00	04	53
	788	00	04	42
	794	00	06	21
	795	00	09	52
	786	00	03	46
	785	00	02	57
	784	00	04	48
	801	00	05	82
	783	00	02	31
	733	00	08	67
	732	00	08	24
	729	00	06	84
	727	00	01	30
	728	00	05	59
	710	00	07	04
	711	00	03	83
	706	00	09	36
	705	00	02	32
	700	00	15	72
	704	00	02	98
	693	00	08	50
	694	00	00	10
	677	00	00	54
	678	00	00	25
	679	00	00	10
	691	00	13	89
	681	00	00	20
	682	00	03	75
	683	00	09	10
	687	00	04	49
	686	00	01	61
	684	00	00	80
	685	00	08	11
	388	00	19	25
	387	00	18	65
	386	00	02	04
	120	00	05	50
	121	00	05	93
	21	00	05	57
	20	00	00	10
	22	00	08	16
	23	00	00	75
	24	00	01	40
	25	00	00	10
	26	00	00	10
	18	00	00	15
	17	00	03	66
	16	00	16	83
	1	00	03	14
	2	00	03	50

[फा. सं. एल.-14014/12/2011-जी.पी.]

के. के. शर्मा, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM AND NATURAL GAS

New Delhi, the 28th February, 2011

S.O. 726.—Whereas it appears to Government of India that it is necessary in public interest that for transportation of natural gas from onshore terminal at East Coast of Andhra Pradesh of M/s. Reliance Industries Limited to consumers in various parts of the country, Kakinada - Basudebpur - Howrah pipeline should be laid by M/s. Relogistics Infrastructure Limited;

And whereas, it appears to Government of India that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the Right of User in land under which the said pipeline is proposed to be laid and which are described in the Schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), Government of India hereby declares its intention to acquire the Right of User therein;

Any person interested in the land described in the said Schedule may, within twenty-one days from the date on which the copies of the notification as published in the Gazette of India under sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the said Act, are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of the Right of User therein for laying the pipeline under the land to Shri Bhaskar Tripathy, Competent Authority, Relogistics Infrastructure Limited, 1st Floor, Fortune Tower, Chandrasekharapur, Bhubaneswar-751023, Orissa State.

SCHEDULE

Mandal/Tehsil/ Taluk : Korai	District : Jajapur	State : Orissa		
Village	Survey No./ Sub-Division	Area to be acquired for ROU		
		Hec	Are	C-Are
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1. Khiro	79	00	13	53
	19	00	02	73
	21	00	06	07
	20	00	02	80
	22	00	03	61
	23	00	00	12
	18	00	08	94
	17	00	00	10
	15	00	11	83
	14	00	00	88
	12	00	04	40

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Khira—Contd.	31	00	00	10	Sarasuda—Contd.	1135	00	07	60
	11	00	07	54		794	00	02	23
	8	00	01	40		431	00	00	10
	9	00	04	20		1138	00	09	00
	3	00	01	07		1134	00	00	43
	4	00	10	15		1584	00	00	10
	7	00	03	88		1139	00	05	69
	6	00	00	80		1140	00	03	22
	5	00	00	54		1141	00	07	94
2. Sarasuda	525	00	02	13		1144	00	09	00
	526	00	06	01		1145	00	00	25
	527	00	01	55		1146	00	08	09
	533	00	07	39		1148	00	00	10
	534	00	02	60		1147	00	06	99
	532	00	09	07		1153	00	00	12
	549	00	02	60		1158	00	00	25
	547	00	03	67		1157	00	01	67
	548	00	06	33		1156	00	04	09
	545	00	01	23		1155	00	12	00
	564	00	10	06		1154	00	03	46
	552	00	00	24		1108	00	00	95
	565	00	07	09		1161	00	13	84
	563	00	00	50		1193	00	03	05
	741	00	03	03		1184	00	04	70
	742	00	01	73		1185	00	15	86
	745	00	02	51		1186	00	02	70
	746	00	05	26		1187	00	03	97
	747	00	04	80		1188	00	09	15
	748	00	29	23		1189	00	00	10
	749	00	02	49		1190	00	13	44
	751	00	01	73		1601	00	00	10
	752	00	03	80		1602	00	04	35
	750	00	01	20		1087	00	00	16
	760	00	00	36		1209	00	06	33
	758	00	06	79		1205	00	01	54
	757	00	00	36		1206	00	01	52
	762	00	02	34		1207	00	02	21
	763	00	02	54		1204	00	00	37
	764	00	00	36		1203	00	00	77
	1137	00	01	20		1202	00	05	27
	1136	00	14	40		1208	00	07	78
						1211	00	00	91

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Sarasuda—Contd.	1200	00	00	92	Jhutana—Contd.	49	00	02	28
	1212	00	09	95		60	00	03	48
	1223	00	04	94		59	00	06	37
	1224	00	00	13		166	00	00	72
	1222	00	16	68		165	00	01	98
	1215	00	01	62		163	00	00	36
	1430	00	03	24		67	00	00	40
	1221	00	07	22		164	00	04	44
	1460	00	02	07		160	00	05	92
	1220	00	00	10		159	00	01	45
	1461	00	16	04		158	00	09	43
	1464	00	10	78		161	00	01	36
	1463	00	13	99		157	00	01	06
	1503	00	09	47		155	00	00	10
	1504	00	47	20		154	00	02	42
	1505	00	34	01		153	00	00	31
Mandal/Tahsil/Taluk: Bhandari Pokhari District : Bhadrak						145	00	12	09
State : Orissa						147	00	01	88
I. Jhutana	1	00	92	55		148	00	00	84
	2978	00	01	23		146	00	11	95
	5	00	21	47		144	00	07	00
	6	00	08	97		194	00	04	23
	7	00	06	05		252	00	02	50
	10	00	03	22		195	00	08	92
	9	00	03	56		205	00	05	85
	32	00	01	11		202	00	00	10
	33	00	04	58		251	00	01	59
	31	00	01	08		207	00	02	21
	29	00	00	10		208	00	01	66
	35	00	05	49		209	00	01	09
	30	00	06	08		206	00	03	50
	39	00	01	64		201	00	00	35
	40	00	02	60		200	00	01	84
	42	00	00	52		210	00	03	87
	41	00	03	88		211	00	01	65
	45	00	02	30		212	00	00	12
	46	00	06	79		198	00	08	94
	47	00	03	53		389	00	07	57
	48	00	02	76		393	00	09	23
	62	00	00	11		394	00	01	64
	61	00	01	87		402	00	00	10
	50	00	01	24		403	00	01	09

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Jhutana—Contd.	418	00	03	80	Jhutana—Contd.	519	00	00	68
	458	00	05	39		523	00	00	73
In bet suy No. 458 &	459	00	01	92		4	00	00	42
	459	00	00	65		522	00	01	37
	468	00	06	19		520	00	01	79
	461	00	01	48		521	00	02	27
	467	00	07	53		525	00	02	35
	470	00	01	70		517	00	06	52
	466	00	01	30		516	00	03	06
	471	00	02	53		527	00	01	18
	465	00	09	40		514	00	04	08
	473	00	00	97		513	00	05	27
	474	00	06	52		512	00	00	82
	744	00	11	82		544	00	00	59
	743	00	04	43		546	00	03	78
	746	00	02	27		545	00	03	29
	742	00	00	92		547	00	01	47
	748	00	03	51		539	00	02	33
	747	00	02	13		548	00	02	84
	781	00	00	10		550	00	00	10
	749	00	00	61		551	00	01	29
	751	00	01	42		559	00	00	41
	777	00	00	11		558	00	00	31
	753	00	00	86		552	00	03	86
	750	00	03	02		557	00	01	19
	752	00	02	33		555	00	01	60
	754	00	01	54		553	00	00	10
	769	00	00	16		554	00	00	28
	735	00	01	61		562	00	00	27
	755	00	04	47		556	00	03	32
	768	00	03	93		563	00	01	13
	756	00	05	21		576	00	01	96
	757	00	02	27		577	00	01	07
	724	00	00	10		578	00	03	60
	720	00	02	65		579	00	02	40
	722	00	00	10		580	00	02	74
	721	00	00	34		581	00	00	10
	719	00	05	26		582	00	07	77
	718	00	00	45		585	00	00	12
	492	00	00	10		3077	00	00	10
	672	00	03	31		583	00	05	60
	518	00	00	33		584	00	07	90

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Jhutana—Contd.	612	00	00	44	Bandalo—Contd.	2001	00	02	30
	2988	00	03	71		1999	00	06	46
	610	00	01	17		2000	00	00	44
	608	00	00	75		1985	00	11	67
	611	00	07	18		21	00	01	60
	615	00	01	38		22	00	04	83
	607	00	02	57		23	00	01	90
	616	00	01	47	4. Deopada	1832	00	07	86
	606	00	01	94		1818	00	01	08
	605	00	04	59		1820	00	00	10
	604	00	01	93		1817	00	11	86
	602	00	01	56		1813	00	04	87
	603	00	04	89		1816	00	03	17
	598	00	12	30		1814	00	00	10
	597	00	08	65		1815	00	01	84
2 Babalpur	336	00	00	39		1826	00	04	16
	337	00	00	78		1827	00	13	80
	396	00	03	52		1806	00	00	16
	395	00	03	60		1805	00	10	16
	394	00	02	98		1896	00	05	65
	393	00	01	11		1795	00	03	13
	398	00	01	64		1794	00	12	04
	392	00	06	68		1793	00	00	78
	399	00	03	86		1787	00	03	75
	405	00	03	79		1789	00	08	75
	400	00	07	78		1788	00	04	90
	404	00	03	56		1747	00	04	03
	403	00	03	80		1750	00	03	10
	402	00	02	95		1749	00	14	19
	401	00	04	74		1748	00	03	31
	681	00	09	81		1715	00	04	93
	679	00	02	24		1716	00	01	27
	678	00	02	20		1717	00	12	51
	677	00	00	47		1719	00	00	10
3. Bandalo	1923	00	00	10		1718	00	00	87
	2054	00	06	56		1709	00	03	92
	2008	00	03	01		1708	00	07	39
	2007	00	10	02		1707	00	03	54
	2006	00	18	51		1694	00	00	51
	1996	00	00	86		1695	00	09	62
	2002	00	07	09		1698	00	02	78
	1998	00	01	04		1696	00	00	46

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Deopada—Contd.	1697	00	09	18	Deopada—Contd.	726	00	00	02
	1601	00	05	17		727	00	12	62
	1600	00	07	91		721	00	13	97
	1599	00	06	08		720	00	08	27
	1596	00	04	80		719	00	06	29
	1598	00	00	22		718	00	09	40
	1597	00	06	54		715	00	06	70
	1580	00	01	48		713	00	03	32
	1581	00	12	49		2482	00	00	34
	1588	00	00	10		2481	00	05	29
	1583	00	07	04		714	00	02	37
	1582	00	03	86		711	00	03	34
	1586	00	01	97		710	00	02	76
	1584	00	06	96		712	00	00	10
	1562	00	00	49		708	00	04	61
	1561	00	06	41		709	00	03	33
	1511	00	06	54		705	00	08	34
	1552	00	11	44		706	00	02	09
	1553	00	04	69		703	00	01	74
	1551	00	07	96		778	00	08	37
	1550	00	00	20		779	00	07	40
	1546	00	17	94		780	00	02	32
	1574	00	04	65		781	00	33	25
	1547	00	05	43		793	00	09	98
	2573	00	03	06		824	00	06	21
	620	00	00	10		825	00	25	03
	619	00	03	43	5. Mandar Garia	463	00	02	86
	618	00	16	38		465	00	11	67
	617	00	00	88		458	00	09	39
	627	00	13	68		464	00	07	60
	631	00	03	95	In bet suy no. 464 &	470	00	17	69
	632	00	05	88		470	00	07	15
	633	00	02	75		472	00	05	74
	634	00	02	54		471	00	05	31
	635	00	00	17		473	00	01	14
	636	00	00	43		475	00	04	82
	637	00	00	78	6. Ageibehera	638	00	12	14
	638	00	02	69		628	00	00	10
	736	00	00	19		684	00	04	75
	640	00	04	95		637	00	04	52
	639	00	05	61		636	00	03	05
	729	00	00	29		635	00	03	28

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Ageibehera—Contd.	632	00	01	04	Rajendrapur—Contd.	614	00	01	88
	633	00	09	93		615	00	02	60
	634	00	00	37		582	00	06	25
	606	00	17	61		617	00	00	22
	640	00	03	60		581	00	02	69
	605	00	01	95		575	00	02	03
	659	00	01	73		574	00	03	37
7. Rajendrapur	941	00	02	36		570	00	05	12
	942	00	03	18		572	00	01	40
	943	00	05	35		571	00	03	78
	953	00	11	27		561	00	00	66
	958	00	00	10		1110	00	01	76
	952	00	05	09		560	00	06	23
	947	00	03	85		553	00	10	67
	948	00	11	49		1089	00	05	06
	930	00	21	51		550	00	06	48
	937	00	01	70		546	00	02	47
	931	00	04	23		535	00	03	65
	932	00	21	34		527	00	03	96
	929	00	05	86		525	00	05	66
	899	00	02	11		524	00	02	61
	683	00	01	60		526	00	02	95
	684	00	04	01		522	00	00	10
	644	00	00	11		530	00	00	32
	643	00	01	28		521	00	23	27
	706	00	21	24		520	00	03	38
	629	00	04	39		112	00	00	59
	628	00	08	42		113	00	00	10
	626	00	05	25		114	00	00	99
	632	00	08	28		115	00	08	80
	625	00	01	17		128	00	03	60
	633	00	07	39		127	00	04	34
	634	00	00	10		1067	00	00	64
	624	00	02	14		129	00	02	08
	635	00	00	10		126	00	05	80
	598	00	09	56		131	00	00	57
	609	00	09	61		125	00	00	10
	608	00	00	18		132	00	04	92
	610	00	19	33		137	00	00	45
	607	00	00	10		139	00	22	80
	611	00	00	69		138	00	01	58
	612	00	00	21		34	00	09	46

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Rajendrapur—Contd.	33	00	07	91	Sanasasan—Contd.	672	00	01	22
	30	00	04	59		670	00	07	24
	32	00	04	98		1226	00	06	20
	31	00	08	12		665	00	02	62
	156	00	00	10		1227	00	03	04
	28	00	21	04		664	00	02	97
	165	00	01	22		663	00	02	16
	166	00	04	19		662	00	00	47
	27	00	00	68		1142	00	11	03
	26	00	00	10		630	00	00	94
	177	00	00	24		1214	00	00	45
	178	00	00	47		656	00	17	86
	179	00	00	76		653	00	00	10
	180	00	05	31		654	00	00	52
	181	00	05	59		655	00	07	11
	182	00	02	98		649	00	09	53
	188	00	01	22		648	00	02	39
	189	00	00	68		646	00	12	87
	187	00	03	15		637	00	04	84
	190	00	04	41		638	00	00	92
	194	00	00	12		639	00	00	54
	193	00	01	54		1213	00	06	66
	191	00	00	87		641	00	00	74
	195	00	00	77		640	00	09	82
	192	00	01	03	9. Mantagaria	552	00	09	31
	197	00	13	21		260	00	02	10
	198	00	00	46		551	00	12	55
8. Sanasasan	735	00	04	18		261	00	01	88
	736	00	00	10		543	00	09	39
	1210	00	01	64		542	00	02	27
	737	00	12	91		541	00	10	12
	739	00	00	57		540	00	03	28
	740	00	08	25		539	00	02	71
	742	00	00	63		538	00	02	59
	741	00	01	88		537	00	03	08
	744	00	06	77		532	00	07	29
	745	00	03	55		536	00	03	70
	746	00	09	72		533	00	03	02
	1224	00	08	25		534	00	04	83
	675	00	10	28		535	00	01	85
	674	00	01	43		520	00	00	21
	673	00	06	13		521	00	13	07

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Mantagaria—Contd.	619	00	07	02	Gandagara—Contd.	85	00	04	12
	495	00	00	50		84	00	04	52
	516	00	12	29		46	00	08	60
	617	00	01	18		87	00	00	12
	497	00	11	72		88	00	01	19
	500	00	00	21		89	00	01	81
	501	00	02	94		45	00	04	43
	502	00	08	47		90	00	05	23
	503	00	09	64		44	00	01	93
	599	00	00	30		37	00	43	72
	488	00	04	95		111	00	02	99
	504	00	07	27		112	00	02	25
	487	00	00	22		137	00	00	65
	476	00	18	99		113	00	03	83
	477	00	02	86		136	00	01	12
	471	00	11	80		115	00	00	29
	469	00	09	45		114	00	05	39
	470	00	04	38		135	00	02	03
	628	00	15	74		133	00	03	04
	452	00	00	15		134	00	01	21
Mandal/Tehsil/Taluk:Bhadrak Rural District : Bhadrak						142	00	02	28
State : Orissa						140	00	00	10
1. Gandagara	253	00	07	11		141	00	00	30
	255	00	00	10		132	00	01	44
	252	00	03	03		129	00	00	68
	73	00	02	43		131	00	01	47
	251	00	03	59		2182	00	01	74
	250	00	00	65		143	00	02	19
	249	00	03	39	2. Gobindapur	257	00	01	48
	247	00	01	15		258	00	02	73
	221	00	07	36		259	00	02	98
	222	00	01	09		714	00	02	10
	220	00	03	79		715	00	02	77
	219	00	01	27		713	00	08	86
	218	00	04	85		717	00	02	40
	217	00	03	87		738	00	02	03
	216	00	04	10		737	00	03	39
	228	00	00	24		739	00	00	58
	215	00	01	86		740	00	10	66
	214	00	04	57		743	00	07	14
	213	00	01	57		741	00	00	20
	83	00	01	96		742	00	00	10

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Gobindapur—Contd.	744	00	06	06	Gobindapur—Contd.	555	00	06	11
	745	00	00	70		551	00	00	46
	701	00	02	31		552	00	09	23
	752	00	05	87		553	00	01	78
	753	00	05	14		543	00	18	88
	700	00	03	95		540	00	09	11
	754	00	01	07		938	00	11	45
	699	00	00	10		544	00	00	10
	959	00	07	51		545	00	03	04
	755	00	16	46		539	00	07	20
	957	00	02	45		538	00	00	10
	759	00	01	63		534	00	11	43
	958	00	07	65		535	00	00	25
	645	00	02	77		536	00	16	54
	646	00	02	90	3. Andhia	1759	00	01	07
	648	00	10	90		1736	00	03	82
	649	00	10	07		1739	00	14	79
	650	00	10	18		1738	00	23	44
	653	00	08	33		1388	00	01	70
	652	00	12	59		1389	00	06	68
	654	00	06	48		1394	00	00	11
	655	00	03	86		1392	00	02	06
	656	00	04	56		1390	00	05	35
	501	00	12	26		1391	00	07	39
	503	00	02	53		1401	00	01	08
	502	00	09	66		1333	00	11	63
	595	00	00	10		1402	00	00	42
	575	00	05	09		1332	00	05	68
	574	00	02	78		1331	00	00	35
	507	00	04	19		1403	00	00	10
	506	00	01	32		1330	00	12	69
	510	00	00	35		1329	00	06	06
	508	00	05	71		1327	00	00	10
	573	00	01	64		1328	00	07	98
	572	00	01	20		1335	00	03	03
	963	00	04	28		1324	00	02	69
	509	00	00	69		1323	00	11	64
	557	00	05	76		1336	00	00	23
	512	00	00	37		1337	00	05	15
	556	00	08	47		2273	00	00	10
	513	00	00	33		1322	00	10	67
	554	00	01	36		1338	00	00	64

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Andhra—Contd.	1321	00	00	39		Raghunathpur	269	00	03	64	
	1291	00	12	63		—Contd.	268	00	05	52	
	1292	00	06	28			128	00	01	45	
	2292	00	07	90			248	00	01	19	
	1284	00	08	87			249	00	02	04	
	1288	00	07	27			247	00	01	37	
	1287	00	05	81			129	00	05	82	
	1286	00	05	22			131	00	01	28	
	1277	00	01	12			246	00	11	77	
	1285	00	04	14			240	00	00	10	
	1278	00	05	70			241	00	01	25	
	1282	00	00	47			133	00	01	58	
	1279	00	12	23			132	00	01	81	
	1274	00	00	10			242	00	00	43	
	1273	00	02	46			245	00	04	15	
	1272	00	05	69			244	00	00	89	
	1268	00	00	10			243	00	01	52	
	1280	00	00	14			134	00	10	03	
	1271	00	05	98			147	00	00	25	
	1270	00	02	58			135	00	01	58	
	1269	00	10	31			137	00	00	10	
	1246	00	01	79			102	00	10	71	
	1245	00	02	49			81	00	10	22	
	2205	00	00	10			82	00	01	44	
	1241	00	12	88			80	00	05	40	
	1243	00	03	91			77	00	02	09	
	1242	00	12	84			79	00	09	75	
	1199	00	04	26			83	00	00	21	
4. Raghunathpur	320	00	00	53			78	00	05	76	
	1095	00	06	40			50	00	06	05	
	315	00	08	39			54	00	21	88	
	316	00	10	47			58	00	00	10	
	317	00	06	38			51	00	13	40	
	311	00	06	19			53	00	02	16	
	313	00	00	13			52	00	11	29	
	263	00	12	99			39	00	04	77	
	309	00	00	32			40	00	04	28	
	264	00	14	87		5. Tunda	38	00	09	98	
	265	00	00	11			37	00	02	63	
	266	00	08	31			35	00	12	41	
	271	00	00	97			36	00	03	25	
	267	00	11	73			802	00	06	09	
							803	00	12	38	
							805	00	00	27	
							806	00	03	76	
							800	00	00	10	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Tunda—Contd.	801	00	02	67	6. Be'ada	1017	00	00	10
	498	00	23	11		1090	00	11	30
	497	00	02	66		1031	00	09	27
	495	00	01	91		1035	00	22	55
	843	00	00	10		1030	00	10	96
	441	00	05	83		1029	00	06	15
	440	00	02	24		579	00	02	65
	439	00	02	92		589	00	02	21
	438	00	03	49		590	00	01	70
	442	00	02	18		588	00	04	41
	443	00	16	19		581	00	00	70
	444	00	05	03		582	00	08	78
	437	00	00	60		587	00	04	28
	445	00	07	55		586	00	00	70
	490	00	05	35		585	00	01	84
	446	00	01	15		583	00	10	45
	448	00	10	03		557	00	00	54
	450	00	00	10		584	00	06	13
	449	00	07	90		554	00	11	79
	465	00	00	47		551	00	10	22
	466	00	09	46		553	00	03	64
	468	00	11	26		552	00	05	14
	485	00	03	06		542	00	10	24
	292	00	00	45		543	00	00	95
	470	00	09	10		540	00	00	48
	471	00	09	57		541	00	06	83
	235	00	02	16		539	00	02	15
	234	00	03	86	7. Narayanpur	254	00	00	10
	233	00	02	35		253	00	05	85
	239	00	03	43		252	00	07	93
	232	00	03	14		110	00	07	95
	228	00	00	10		112	00	01	29
	226	00	00	24		111	00	03	09
	213	00	01	50		113	00	00	10
	231	00	09	24		109	00	03	35
	230	00	00	13		108	00	08	13
	216	00	12	87		115	00	00	10
	217	00	04	80		107	00	07	66
	255	00	05	51		102	00	17	77
	206	00	09	59		81	00	14	23
	205	00	00	54		98	00	01	34
	207	00	15	56		83	00	02	88
	204	00	01	41		82	00	00	66
	203	00	02	62		84	00	10	68
	202	00	12	01		88	00	00	10
	201	00	08	06		85	00	00	10

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Narayanpur	86	00	04	96	Kantia—Contd.	2515	00	00	23
—Contd.	452	00	07	75		2516	00	03	87
	453	00	02	51		2517	00	02	72
	87	00	00	10		2511	00	20	00
	74	00	11	85		2510	00	01	16
	73	00	00	10		2508	00	00	95
	41	00	00	82		2509	00	08	25
	42	00	20	45		2505	00	02	37
	464	00	00	82		2498	00	01	62
	43	00	05	31		2499	00	04	33
	458	00	03	79		2497	00	00	10
	44	00	12	35		2491	00	02	14
	27	00	00	49		2490	00	08	85
	455	00	03	46		2489	00	01	86
	28	00	00	34		2477	00	02	04
	450	00	10	97		2552	00	05	83
	25	00	00	47	9. Ganijanga	2246	00	11	42
	26	00	07	44		2338	00	07	17
	50	00	01	90		2245	00	08	91
8. Kantia	1868	00	00	23		2187	00	00	28
	1870	00	01	47		2244	00	13	88
	1871	00	02	12		2201	00	13	19
	1869	00	00	15		2202	00	01	73
	1872	00	06	69		2203	00	02	14
	1882	00	00	10		2204	00	05	16
	1881	00	01	42		2205	00	01	57
	1880	00	01	09		2206	00	06	70
	1879	00	01	34		2210	00	01	83
	1878	00	02	67		2209	00	02	36
	1877	00	00	85		2207	00	04	65
	2618	00	02	82		2208	00	01	07
	2538	00	03	47		2134	00	35	66
	2541	00	05	82		2131	00	02	70
	2542	00	00	98		2130	00	02	08
	2545	00	29	55		2129	00	02	79
	2529	00	08	36		2221	00	00	10
	2527	00	03	91		2128	00	00	10
	2526	00	05	83		2127	00	03	04
	2528	00	01	60		2126	00	10	21
	2525	00	02	53		2125	00	02	25
	2522	00	03	25		2124	00	10	51
	2524	00	11	56		2123	00	07	22
						2121	00	00	15
						2120	00	16	75

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
10. Kusun Nagar	2169	00	02	90	Kusun Nagar	1728	00	00	10
	2167	00	06	49	—Contd.	1722	00	00	10
	2166	00	00	34		1724	00	05	74
	2146	00	10	95		1723	00	01	79
	2148	00	02	70		1557	00	04	44
	2142	00	00	98		2847	00	05	78
	2147	00	07	59		1558	00	11	09
	2149	00	00	30		1544	00	07	49
	2141	00	04	34		1561	00	07	84
	1825	00	02	85		1560	00	00	10
	1826	00	05	73		1541	00	00	10
	2139	00	01	80		1540	00	07	99
	1827	00	01	70		1536	00	04	80
	1829	00	02	64		1535	00	00	10
	1828	00	01	59		1537	00	20	87
	1831	00	00	65		1539	00	00	48
	1830	00	04	15		1538	00	07	34
	1812	00	01	07		1520	00	00	87
	1811	00	03	86		1521	00	20	40
	1809	00	01	68		1514	00	06	58
	1810	00	02	50		1513	00	06	50
	1805	00	00	17		1510	00	06	68
	1804	00	04	96		1498	00	07	76
	1801	00	01	48		1497	00	06	15
	1802	00	07	56		1496	00	07	06
	1803	00	04	02		1487	00	02	16
	1757	00	19	13		1488	00	04	23
	2905	00	04	90		1489	00	06	07
	2814	00	13	13		1477	00	05	43
	2813	00	03	17		1476	00	07	43
	1758	00	07	75		1473	00	00	43
	1759	00	02	21		1475	00	07	13
	1763	00	21	08		1474	00	02	53
	1765	00	00	39		1469	00	03	14
	1766	00	07	78		1467	00	03	91
	1767	00	11	54		1468	00	05	66
	1770	00	00	09		1466	00	01	07
	1768	00	01	07		2775	00	01	06
	1769	00	09	62		1463	00	02	45
	1726	00	03	14		1462	00	03	43
	1725	00	08	10		1464	00	00	92
	1727	00	00	41		1461	00	03	72

VRS(F) to Smt. Pan Muni Manjhian. So, the dependent son of Smt. Pan Muni Manjhian, concerned workman, is entitled for employment in M/s. BCCL. The management is directed to give employment to the dependent son of Smt. Pan Muni Manjhian, namely, Paresh Manjhi, within 30 days from the date of publication of the award.

This is my Award.

H. M. SINGH, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 11 फरवरी, 2011

का.आ. 733.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार बी.सी.सी.एल. के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय नं. 1, धनबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 150/1990) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 11-02-2011 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-20012/114/1988-आईआर(सी-1)]

डी.एस.एस. श्रीनिवास राव, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 11th February, 2011

S.O. 733.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 150/1990) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No. 1, Dhanbad, as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Industry Colliery M/s. BCCL, and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 11-02-2011.

[No. L-20012/114/1988-IR(C-1)]

D.S.S.SRINIVASA RAO, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL No. 1, DHANBAD

In the matter of a reference U/s. 10(i)(d)(2A) of ID Act

Reference No. 150 of 1990

Parties : Employers in relation to the management of
Industry Colliery of M/s. B.C.C.Ltd.

AND

Their Workmen

PRESENT : Shri H. M. Singh, Presiding Officer

APPEARANCES:

For the Employers : None

For the Workmen : None

Dated, the 31-01-2011

AWARD

By Order No. L-20012/114/88-IR(Coal-I) dated 13-7-1990 the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour has, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal :

“Whether the demand of Bihar Colliery Kamgar Union that the date of birth of Sri Bhagwan Das. Trasser, Industry Colliery of M/s. BCCL is 4-6-38 ? If so, what relief the concerned workman is entitled to ?”

In this reference case both the parties have filed their respective written statements, rejoinders and documents. Thereafter the case was fixed for 25-8-10 for adducing evidence by the workman for which registered notices were sent to both the parties. But on 25-8-10 neither side appeared for which case was adjourned to 24-9-10. Again on 24-9-10 neither side appeared, so the case was adjourned to 12-11-10. On that date also none appeared from either side. As such, it appears that neither the concerned workman nor the sponsoring union is interested to contest the case.

Accordingly, I render the ‘No Dispute’ award in the present industrial dispute.

H. M. SINGH, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 11 फरवरी, 2011

का.आ. 734.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एरोफ्लोट रशियन एयरलाइन्स के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय दिल्ली, नं. 1 के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 13/2010) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 10-12-2010 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-20025/01/2011-आईआर(सी-1)]

डी.एस.एस. श्रीनिवास राव, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 11th February, 2011

S.O. 734.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 13/2010) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No. 1 Delhi, as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. Aeroflot Russian Airlines, and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 10-12-2010.

[No. L-20025/01/2011-IR(C-1)]

D.S.S.SRINIVASA RAO, Desk Officer

नई दिल्ली, 28 फरवरी, 2011

का.आ. 727.—भारत सरकार को लोकहित में यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स रिलाएन्स इंडस्ट्रीज लिमिटेड के आन्ध्र प्रदेश में पूर्वी तट पर ऑनशोर टर्मिनल से देश के विभिन्न हिस्सों में उपभोक्ताओं तक प्राकृतिक गैस के परिवहन के लिए, मैसर्स रिलोजिस्टिक्स इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर लिमिटेड द्वारा काकोनाडा-बासुदेबपुर-हावड़ा पाइपलाइन बिछाई जानी चाहिए;

और भारत सरकार को उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि उस भूमि में, जिसके भीतर उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने का प्रस्ताव है और जो इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित है, उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाए;

अतः, अब, भारत सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उनमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है;

कोई व्यक्ति, जो उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध है, उस तारीख से जिसको उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन जारी की गई अधिसूचना की प्रतियां साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध कर दी जाती हैं, इक्कीस दिन के भीतर, भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार के अर्जन के संबंध में श्री भास्कर त्रिपाठी, सक्षम प्राधिकारी, मैसर्स रिलोजिस्टिक्स इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर लिमिटेड, प्रथम मंजिल, फोर्चुन टावर, चन्द्रशेखरपुर, मुधनेश्वर-751023, ओडिशा राज्य को लिखित रूप में आक्षेप भेज सकेगा।

अनुसूची

मंडल/तहसील/तालुक : भद्रक देहात जिला : भद्रक राज्य : ओडिशा

गांव का नाम	सर्वे सं/सब डिविजन सं.	आर.ओ.यू. अर्जित करने के लिए क्षेत्रफल	हेक्टेयर	एयर सि एयर
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
(1) चरेया	250	00	00	10
	23	00	03	30
	18	00	13	70
	15	00	01	82
	13	00	05	63
	12/12	00	05	63
	10/10	00	00	10
	11/11	00	08	63
	7/7	00	06	14
	6/6	00	11	82

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
चरेया - जारी	5/4	00	02	10
	5/5	00	06	78
	69	00	01	66
	75/50	00	12	79
	77/55	00	05	41
	78/56	00	02	28
	49	00	00	33
	79	00	00	82
	80	00	02	14
	83/58	00	02	83
	87	00	01	59
	81/57	00	06	72
	60	00	00	16
(2) तिगिरिआ	621/247	00	00	10
	625/251	00	11	17
	626/252	00	08	11
	638/262	00	02	92
	637/261	00	11	97

मंडल/तहसील/तालुक : सोरो : जिला बालेश्वर राज्य : ओडिशा

(1) भाटपडा	20	00	04	91
	21	00	01	91
	19	00	04	07
	22	07	07	02
	23	00	03	40
	29	00	01	10
	24	00	06	91
	27	00	04	79
	25	00	00	22
	26	00	03	82
	28	00	04	72
	16	00	11	63
	49	00	17	78
	15	00	06	30
	10	00	04	83
	9	00	08	13
(2) बणपारिआ	5/8	00	02	85
	4/7	00	14	23
	6/9	00	01	86
	13/16	00	18	00
	14/17	00	18	45
	4	00	01	18
	19	00	00	12

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
बणपारिआ-जारी	16/20	00	00	10	मधुसुदनपुर-जारी	184	00	12	64
	17/21	00	24	94		183	00	12	70
	18/22	00	00	16		186	00	07	48
	19/23	00	17	01		187	00	04	54
	31/36	00	00	21		188	00	00	80
(3) कुरुणिया	1349	00	12	18		191	00	00	10
	1347	00	00	10		192	00	00	84
	1348	00	09	83		182	00	04	56
	1350	00	14	15		193	00	12	31
	1346	00	19	27		194	00	01	76
	1343	00	03	54		230	00	08	58
	1342	00	00	41		229	00	04	25
	1352	00	10	06		231	00	08	33
	1353	00	04	00		226	00	14	90
	1354	00	05	81		234	00	00	79
	1355	00	06	12		235	00	08	44
	1356	00	04	37		236	00	34	10
	1357	00	00	50		642	00	02	71
	1324	00	04	81		242	00	00	68
	1358	00	17	93		641	00	00	49
	1323	00	00	17		633	00	00	62
	1130	00	02	10		640	00	00	34
	1127	00	02	34		616	00	10	77
	1126	00	05	15		617	00	23	45
	1125	00	00	12		619	00	05	68
(4) कोलथा	11/13	00	01	11		620	00	06	40
	10/12	00	09	80		626	00	00	30
	9/11	00	19	86		621	00	03	97
	8/10	00	07	23		622	00	01	26
	14	00	04	34		624	00	01	55
	14/17	00	05	08		623	00	04	35
	15/18	00	24	88		614	00	02	95
	16/19	00	04	93		625	00	00	10
	17/20	00	04	20		610	00	01	46
	24/28	00	04	21		609	00	04	35
	23/27	00	00	29		608	00	00	87
	18/21	00	00	10		607	00	09	82
	21/24	00	04	17		606	00	00	94
	22/26	00	18	13		605	00	03	71
	25	00	00	50		604	00	09	50
(5) मधुसुदनपुर	151	00	01	20		603	00	05	78
	179	00	10	37		598	00	08	87
						602	00	06	05
						599	00	03	57

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
मधुसुदनपुर-जारी	577	00	00	14	वैशिखाजी-जारी	47	00	04	21
	600	00	00	10		49	00	03	19
	560	00	00	88		48	00	02	52
	526	00	00	73		512	00	00	28
	527	00	05	05		50	00	01	84
	528	00	01	04		51	00	07	07
	529	00	01	27		53	00	00	15
	523	00	34	31		52	00	03	44
	520	00	12	69		54	00	00	16
	524	00	00	10		16/55	00	07	45
	723	00	05	40		17/56	00	05	50
(6) चंदाटिकिरी	6	00	05	04	(8) गुहालडिहा	360	00	00	24
	10	00	01	07		234	00	17	16
	9	00	00	80		236	00	12	13
	7	00	08	95		235	00	11	88
	4	00	00	10		514	00	02	61
	5	00	00	34		237	00	14	97
	8	00	05	73		230	00	00	22
	24	00	02	15		229	00	15	19
	1	00	26	41		224	00	06	83
	72	00	00	54		228	00	03	00
(7) वैशिखाजी	1	00	10	96		226	00	00	32
	115	00	01	66		225	00	08	90
	114	00	04	72		163	00	08	38
	117	00	02	48		165	00	00	01
	113	00	03	46		167	00	07	87
	5/10	00	17	35		162	00	02	10
	4/9	00	12	12		142	00	02	37
	8	00	03	92		140	00	01	11
	13	00	00	10		141	00	10	42
	3/7	00	06	61		139	00	15	65
	22	00	06	23		137	00	10	13
	23	00	01	93		135	00	02	10
	6/24	00	06	45		136	00	01	17
	7/30	00	11	77		134	00	03	70
	9/32	00	07	13		128	00	00	27
	10/35	00	10	52		114	00	05	01
	29/87	00	01	95		113	00	00	68
	38	00	11	76		115	00	04	09
	83	00	15	80		112	00	09	40
	13/40	00	02	51		110	00	04	01
	2682	00	04	75		111	00	06	39
	43	00	01	57		104	00	10	66
	45	00	02	08		105	00	00	40
	46	00	01	78		106	00	02	57

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
गुहालडिहा—जारी	516	00	00	39					
	120	00	03	32	(10) श्यामराइपुर—जारी	63	00	04	98
(9) नदिगों	1754	00	44	81		62	00	07	07
	1756	00	05	34		57	00	07	89
	1867	00	06	34		49	00	22	76
	1868	00	32	73		47	00	01	47
	1866	00	03	90		51	00	07	22
	1864	00	14	57		52	00	02	09
	1858	00	09	98	(11) सतसंख	905	00	09	24
	1859	00	02	30		842	00	01	68
	1860	00	00	23		787	00	10	38
	1857	00	08	80		782	00	05	53
	1856	00	01	34		783	00	09	25
	1861	00	14	22		784	00	00	50
	1855	00	02	08		786	00	03	61
	1837	00	03	61		785	00	04	27
	1836	00	14	60		778	00	03	83
	1835	00	08	76		792	00	07	09
	1937	00	01	69		768	00	04	12
	1834	00	07	91		770	00	00	63
	1833	00	12	08		769	00	04	69
	1832	00	10	19		767	00	02	59
	1829	00	00	10		771	00	00	10
	1827	00	00	29		766	00	20	32
	1828	00	08	03		722	00	19	73
	113	00	18	62		723	00	04	95
	114	00	05	19		724	00	02	98
	105	00	03	40		2835	00	00	10
(10) श्यामराइपुर	181	00	01	71		717	00	02	13
	182	00	16	45		716	00	02	08
	183	00	05	74		715	00	02	57
	184	00	03	77		713	00	14	72
	165	00	00	44		711	00	00	52
	164	00	16	34		698	00	12	75
	163	00	02	36		2781	00	05	81
	112	00	16	98		702	00	05	08
	115	00	04	55		701	00	06	02
	117	00	12	22		700	00	00	27
	116	00	20	72		649	00	03	22
	193	00	07	88		645	00	02	38
	69	00	00	20		648	00	03	37
	122	00	14	46		651	00	09	44
	68	00	23	68		647	00	01	62
	66	00	11	18		2816	00	05	27
	64	00	01	02		634	00	04	43
						638	00	05	99

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
सतसंख-जारी	639	00	03	81	चहलिया-जारी	586	00	01	94
	636	00	01	46		584	00	13	56
	637	00	08	51		585	00	07	28
	607	00	15	90		580	00	10	90
	604	00	06	51		579	00	02	59
	605	00	12	56		578	00	08	82
	606	00	01	75		577	00	04	75
	589	00	06	96		576	00	04	79
	588	00	03	49		575	00	02	63
	587	00	04	81		574	00	02	38
	575	00	10	15		570	00	07	33
	579	00	00	10		571	00	03	21
	576	00	17	19		568	00	04	37
	555	00	07	99		567	00	06	43
	559	00	05	93		566	00	04	49
	558	00	03	66		564	00	02	01
	556	00	13	12		565	00	08	68
	557	00	03	86	(13) किआमुडिया	59	00	11	70
	552	00	01	49		13	00	09	14
	546	00	02	61		16	00	18	99
(12) चहलिया	405	00	03	52		30	00	01	00
	407	00	14	35		8	00	00	32
	411	00	03	53		60	00	13	51
	410	00	14	10		15	00	01	17
	412	00	00	48		63	00	04	79
	717	00	12	23		52	00	10	41
	703	00	02	68		18	00	00	18
	704	00	00	39		19	00	00	83
	716	00	08	93		20	00	14	71
	705	00	11	52		58	00	00	88
	706	00	08	93		21	00	02	73
	693	00	05	47	(14) बालिपुर	547	00	01	77
	676	00	21	15		514	00	00	10
	660	00	00	69		513	00	22	11
	661	00	10	02		518	00	06	88
	659	00	10	84		503	00	01	08
	665	00	00	18		499	00	14	20
	658	00	16	81		571	00	00	88
	596	00	02	07		497	00	03	68
	599	00	13	36		498	00	03	59
	598	00	02	48		522	00	03	39
	597	00	03	60		575	00	01	08
	600	00	00	77		410	00	02	06
	601	00	05	27		574	00	08	58
	587	00	13	11		489	00	21	15

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
बालिपुर-जारी	277	00	15	84	रंगपति (निरंतर)	748	00	00	52
	261	00	48	06		750	00	01	44
	0	00	03	89		749	00	04	91
	244	00	05	87		292	00	04	74
	247	00	09	57		26	00	02	46
	557	00	00	21		25	00	03	67
	246	00	00	10		24	00	05	05
सर्वे सं. 246 और	00	01	61			23	00	20	72
गाँव सीमा के बीच						20	00	00	38
में						21	00	01	70
(15) रंगपति	101	00	24	56		22	00	03	99
	100	00	19	13		13	00	00	10
	99	00	01	05		1	00	01	06
	78	00	05	63	(16) चंपो	61	00	06	64
	81	00	19	02		62	00	03	53
	80	00	04	37		63	00	00	36
	726	00	09	99		68	00	14	94
	727	00	00	31		69	00	01	64
	82	00	02	90		67	00	09	32
	83	00	27	93		70	00	11	94
	84	00	06	41		71	00	23	80
	85	00	04	05		72	00	00	19
	86	00	08	54		79	00	03	25
	130	00	03	78		53	00	02	87
	271	00	15	43		52	00	15	10
	272	00	07	18		50	00	02	18
	273	00	05	19		51	00	13	68
	270	00	01	09		48	00	15	99
	274	00	00	26		40	00	01	96
	275	00	04	73		39	00	02	55
	276	00	03	63		80	00	11	53
	277	00	00	58		144	00	16	81
	279	00	02	65		147	00	06	95
	280	00	09	23		149	00	08	83
	281	00	00	51		148	00	00	10
	282	00	00	10		151	00	01	37
	762	00	00	59		150	00	17	50
	283	00	00	30		161	00	02	47
	287	00	05	43		177	00	08	82
	761	00	03	09		162	00	12	33
	284	00	00	10		163	00	02	60
	752	00	03	75		165	00	18	23
	288	00	00	60		168	00	11	54
	751	00	02	29		170	00	00	15
	787	00	05	14		169	00	06	11

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
चंपो (निरंतर)	171	00	12	59	आंगुला (निरंतर)	1948	00	09	70
	172	00	00	41		1949	00	00	19
(17) आंगुला	1492	00	05	14		1947	00	07	64
	1494	00	06	05		1945	00	00	10
	1493	00	05	92		1955	00	01	71
	1495	00	06	00		1956	00	01	50
	1505	00	02	44		1946	00	07	59
	1504	00	10	51		857	00	01	35
	1503	00	02	86		856	00	04	24
	1575	00	02	50		1957	00	06	49
	1576	00	03	15		854	00	11	89
	1788	00	00	46		853	00	00	58
	1789	00	02	00		852	00	04	60
	1804	00	03	89		855	00	01	80
	1790	00	03	02		850	00	00	17
	1805	00	00	10		851	00	07	58
	1803	00	01	12		847	00	11	47
	1791	00	00	11		848	00	02	70
	1802	00	12	05	(18) मंती	16	00	20	86
	1810	00	00	97		36	00	11	24
	1801	00	09	96		37	00	11	53
	1798	00	00	19		35	00	02	55
	1797	00	44	48		34	00	00	52
	1867	00	02	33		26	00	16	53
	1863	00	01	93		24	00	05	08
	2306	00	00	10		23	00	15	58
	1864	00	01	21		22	00	00	10
	1869	00	00	33		21	00	34	23
	1861	00	17	06		17	00	14	59
	1856	00	01	67		374	00	00	17
	1852	00	00	10		2579	00	03	44
	2087	00	13	78		377	00	10	82
	2090	00	09	29		380	00	01	52
	2093	00	03	15		379	00	19	06
	2089	00	11	17		378	00	07	63
	2085	00	15	85		408	00	47	66
	2082	00	05	74		981	00	01	94
	2081	00	05	49		1010	00	07	79
	2080	00	04	17		1011	00	06	65
	2079	00	16	87		1009	00	01	74
	2072	00	01	93		1008	00	04	32
	2073	00	20	29		1012	00	00	10
	1941	00	04	85		1007	00	04	36
	1943	00	00	34		1018	00	03	03
	1944	00	06	50		1006	00	08	93

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
मंती (निरंतर)	1019	00	08	04	केशरिपुर (निरंतर)	2544	00	07	21
	1025	00	00	77		2545	00	02	89
	1022	00	05	16		2522	00	01	31
	1024	00	07	25		2599	00	07	69
	1023	00	03	02		2598	00	05	89
	1026	00	07	38		2601	00	05	89
(19) केशरिपुर	1913	00	01	06		2516	00	00	21
	1914	00	00	10		2604	00	05	20
	1915	00	26	42		2602	00	05	99
	1902	00	02	05		2603	00	04	68
	1903	00	00	54		2605	00	13	71
	1901	00	09	50		2606	00	07	66
	1884	00	03	78		2607	00	06	96
	1883	00	10	19		2613	00	08	16
	1879	00	00	10		2611	00	04	66
	1882	00	10	99		2612	00	00	16
	1891	00	06	88		2610	00	05	29
	1874	00	08	99		1208	00	02	01
	2820	00	01	17		1207	00	21	79
	2798	00	04	01		1155	00	00	77
	1873	00	01	01		1206	00	00	21
	1872	00	01	31		1202	00	12	36
	1871	00	00	76		1203	00	04	73
	1869	00	14	76		1201	00	18	59
	2014	00	04	72		1172	00	40	65
	2015	00	00	88		सर्वे सं 1172	00	27	68
	2013	00	12	60		और 1182 के			
	1986	00	00	49		बीच में			
	1985	00	00	49		1182	00	01	35
	1992	00	00	52		1181	00	00	28
	1987	00	44	84		1091	00	02	86
	1988	00	04	69		1090	00	47	15
	2004	00	08	82		1093	00	02	82
	2024	00	00	66		1096	00	08	22
	2003	00	11	87		1097	00	00	18
	2002	00	05	63	(20) महिषासुरी	170	00	02	30
	2534	00	12	22		169	00	13	13
	2535	00	04	20		168	00	03	76
	2536	00	08	96		167	00	02	02
	2533	00	00	54		166	00	04	43
	2537	00	05	99		137	00	22	77
	2538	00	04	68		138	00	01	27
	2540	00	12	17		118	00	10	26
	2543	00	01	81		120	00	08	92
	2542	00	07	37		123	00	00	93

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
महिषासुरी-जारी	103	00	00	10	चितामणिपुर-जारी	189	00	02	06
	124	00	04	29		190	00	00	49
	102	00	07	42		191	00	01	83
	101	00	08	76		482	00	08	79
	126	00	00	34		483	00	01	41
	95	00	28	36		487	00	03	41
	100	00	13	14		512	00	02	33
	96	00	02	43		488	00	02	73
मंडल/तहसील/तालुक : निलगिरी : जिला बालेश्वर राज्य : ओडिशा						490	00	01	17
(1) ईश्वरपुर	565	00	06	97		489	00	01	47
	566	00	02	00		491	00	06	51
	567	00	02	33		492	00	05	00
	564	00	06	11		415	00	01	20
	559	00	02	88		411	00	11	74
	568	00	06	04		414	00	10	58
	570	00	00	24		412	00	02	22
	574	00	01	44		413	00	07	89
	572	00	03	87		403	00	01	27
	573	00	11	03		404	00	11	13
	576	00	01	07		516	00	00	10
	578	00	03	14		405	00	01	60
	577	00	02	06		396	00	12	99
	579	00	15	05		397	00	05	94
	542	00	03	55		398	00	01	92
	539	00	02	61		399	00	01	66
	538	00	03	93		386	00	10	11
	536	00	00	68		387	00	04	24
	537	00	13	22		363	00	00	26
	17	00	02	26		535	00	04	62
	21	00	00	47	(3) कांडागरडी	1557	00	07	67
	16	00	18	38		1558	00	01	56
	15	00	00	31		1559	00	02	22
	4	00	02	13		1560	00	04	81
	5	00	00	58		1561	00	03	91
	3	00	02	74		1562	00	05	66
	1627	00	01	75		1542	00	18	07
	2	00	03	97		1540	00	00	10
	1	00	02	40		1541	00	02	17
	580	00	00	32		3189	00	20	37
(2) चितामणिपुर	176	00	03	00		1531	00	02	99
	175	00	27	06		1530	00	04	13
	181	00	01	76		1528	00	00	10
	182	00	01	57		1527	00	05	12
	183	00	02	65		1526	00	05	58
	187	00	00	10		1525	00	06	53

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
कांडागरडी (निरंतर)	1514	00	00	10
	1515	00	04	52
	3262	00	08	81
	1524	00	00	66
	1516	00	17	35
	1487	00	00	66
	2415	00	04	80
	1486	00	05	70
	2416	00	07	41
	1484	00	03	68
	2427	00	04	89
	2426	00	01	13
	2434	00	05	53
	2425	00	00	67
	2435	00	02	81
	2436	00	00	48
	1478	00	03	09
	1474	00	04	23
	1475	00	00	40
	1473	00	03	32
	1472	00	07	00
	1471	00	02	68
	1470	00	08	54
	1442	00	04	05
	1443	00	01	09
	1444	00	00	81
	1441	00	09	28
	1445	00	00	10
	1373	00	07	38
	1372	00	00	10
	1374	00	00	69
	1379	00	04	04
	1385	00	00	10
	1380	00	03	19
	1381	00	07	27
	1382	00	04	95
	1383	00	02	69
	1384	00	00	76
4) कन्हपुर	गाँव सीमा कंदा- गराडी और गाँव सीमा	00	01	59
	696	00	04	60
	703	00	09	15
	711	00	14	57
	712	00	00	10

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
कन्हपुर-जारी	710	00	05	69
	713	00	09	20
	714	00	08	25
	680	00	03	03
	676	00	13	50
	715	00	06	28
	663	00	06	19
	661	00	09	76
	660	00	05	41
	636	00	00	21
	659	00	18	11
	643	00	06	96
	644	00	00	10
	642	00	16	38
	641	00	02	21
	469	00	03	17
	468	00	05	86
	470	00	04	65
	471	00	00	28
	434	00	07	81
	444	00	02	27
	445	00	00	55
	856	00	01	20
	443	00	06	86
	442	00	01	88
	446	00	01	89
	437	00	00	38
	441	00	05	50
	440	00	02	21
	438	00	01	72
	439	00	01	22
	421	00	04	39
	420	00	04	86
	419	00	02	02
	422	00	00	16
	394	00	08	61
	412	00	02	67
	410	00	00	67
	411	00	14	58
	405	00	15	70
	404	00	02	35
	406	00	00	97
	398	00	00	10
	402	00	03	06
	401	00	07	78

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
(5) कोलिगडी	817	00	02	32	खडीपडा-जारी	20	00	01	15
	807	00	00	10		35	00	07	77
	816	00	14	78		30	00	08	13
	821	00	00	10		21	00	03	90
	815	00	25	23		22	00	04	41
	822	00	00	25		29	00	01	42
	823	00	03	47		23	00	06	24
	814	00	04	05		24	00	08	04
	594	00	01	21		25	00	15	47
	595	00	11	18	(8) जोकगाडिआ	596	00	01	75
	562	00	09	12		595	00	00	27
	561	00	07	86		593	00	11	61
	564	00	00	45		588	00	16	00
	559	00	00	95		587	00	01	11
	560	00	04	10		590	00	01	15
	555	00	01	37		589	00	19	12
	558	00	01	46	(9) अस्तीआ	290	00	01	91
	557	00	00	68		291	00	00	10
	556	00	06	48		292	00	00	12
	553	00	00	18		328	00	00	28
	538	00	00	28		327	00	08	38
	449	00	01	88		298	00	04	55
	450	00	08	42		299	00	00	10
	447	00	08	54		300	00	01	36
	446	00	11	51		302	00	00	73
	442	00	06	64		301	00	03	58
	441	00	16	57		326	00	04	31
	436	00	00	38		325	00	00	51
	440	00	04	34		303	00	24	58
	439	00	00	55		311	00	00	10
	438	00	08	79		312	00	02	73
(6) हुंयपुर	21	00	02	58		315	00	00	64
	379	00	13	37		314	00	10	88
	412	00	01	02		313	00	13	24
	397	00	00	25		213	00	05	06
	20	00	02	82		208	00	03	04
	413	00	09	64		209	00	01	58
	19	00	00	42		210	00	00	13
	16	00	05	66		212	00	01	94
	15	00	04	70		573	00	03	04
(7) खडीपडा	310	00	04	95		35	00	00	71
	37	00	10	83		57	00	09	03
	36	00	16	30		58	00	05	81
	17	00	00	19		59	00	02	15
	33	00	03	50		60	00	01	77
	34	00	14	75		61	00	07	70

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
अस्तीआ -जारी	99	00	20	22	खिरपदा-जारी	30	00	34	65
	64	00	01	24		6	00	11	51
	98	00	25	01		5	00	07	52
	97	00	00	10		4	00	01	31
	106	00	09	03	(2) रफाएतपुर	1120	00	08	24
	107	00	18	55		1121	00	00	59
	123	00	01	19		1122	00	04	41
	984	00	00	10		1095	00	14	56
	122	00	16	75		1094	00	27	18
	109	00	00	10		1096	00	00	27
	983	00	06	15		1093	00	01	38
	121	00	04	30		1092	00	00	15
	120	00	03	53		1091	00	12	90
	119	00	01	45		1089	00	05	89
	116	00	04	34		1090	00	08	87
	115	00	20	30		1088	00	01	68
मंडल/तहसील/तालुक : खैरा : जिला बालेश्वर				राज्य : ओडिशा		1087	00	07	56
(1) खिरपदा	127	00	00	95		1086	00	07	12
	124	00	31	35		1085	00	00	27
	110	00	00	10		1040	00	02	53
	109	00	01	17		1039	00	04	61
	108	00	02	25		1038	00	05	31
	107	00	00	44		1037	00	09	34
	102	00	01	17		1128	00	01	39
	1	00	00	23	(3) दुर्गापुर	7	00	03	02
	58	00	06	65		62	00	02	54
	59	00	04	50		61	00	02	57
	60	00	00	10		60	00	02	74
	66	00	00	88		59	00	04	89
	67	00	05	31		64	00	00	10
	68	00	02	61		56	00	00	83
	69	00	00	27		57	00	01	71
	70	00	08	39		54	00	00	10
	57	00	00	10		53	00	05	05
	1077	00	20	43		58	00	08	28
	72	00	00	39		46	00	02	69
	56	00	06	06		43	00	07	15
	52	00	01	18		45	00	06	37
	51	00	19	26		44	00	00	95
	45	00	06	36		12	00	10	60
	44	00	07	51		15	00	23	90
	37	00	00	10		14	00	01	06
	36	00	06	12		17	00	11	14
	32	00	00	10					
	31	00	02	40					

[फा. सं. एल. 14014/13/2011-जी.पी.]

के.के. शर्मा, अवर सचिव

New Delhi the 28th February, 2011

S. O. 727.— Whereas it appears to Government of India that it is necessary in public interest that for transportation of natural gas from onshore terminal at East coast of Andhra Pradesh of M/s. Reliance Industries Limited to consumers in various parts of the country, Kakinada-Basudebpur-Howrah pipeline should be laid by M/s Relogistics Infrastructure Limited;

And whereas, it appears to Government of India that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the Right of User in land under which the said pipeline is proposed to be laid and which are described in the Schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), Government of India hereby declares its intention to acquire the Right of User therein;

Any person interested in the land described in the said Schedule may, within twenty-one days from the date on which the copies of the notification as published in the Gazette of India under sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the said Act, are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of the Right of User therein for laying the pipeline under the land to Shri Bhaskar Tripathy, Competent Authority, Relogistics Infrastructure Limited, 1st Floor, Fortune Tower, Chandrasekharapur, Bhubaneswar-751023, Orissa State.

SCHEDULE

Mandal/Tehsil/Taluk :	District	State :			
Bhadrak Rural	Bhadrak	Orissa			
Village	Survey No./ Sub-Division	Area to be acquired for ROU			
		Hec	Are	C-Are	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	
(1) Chareya	250		00	00	10
	23		00	03	30
	18		00	13	70
	15		00	01	82
	13		00	05	63
	12/12		00	05	63
	10/10		00	00	10
	11/11		00	08	63
	7/7		00	06	14
	6/6		00	11	82
5/4		00	02	10	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Chareya (Contd.)	5/5	00	06	78
	69	00	01	66
	75/50	00	12	79
	77/55	00	05	41
	78/56	00	02	28
	49	00	00	33
	79	00	00	82
	80	00	02	14
	83/58	00	02	83
	87	00	01	59
	81/57	00	06	72
	60	00	00	16
(2) Tigiria	621/247	00	00	10
	625/251	00	11	17
	626/252	00	08	11
	638/262	00	02	92
	637/261	00	11	97
Mandal/Tehsil/ :		District :	State	
Taluk : Soro		Baleshwar	Orissa	
(1) Bhatapada	20	00	04	91
	21	00	01	91
	19	00	04	07
	22	07	03	02
	23	00	03	40
	29	00	01	10
	24	00	06	91
	27	00	04	79
	25	00	00	22
	26	00	03	82
	28	00	04	72
	16	00	11	63
	49	00	17	78
	15	00	06	30
	10	00	04	83
	9	00	08	13
(2) Banaparia	5/8	00	02	85
	4/7	00	14	23
	6/9	00	01	86
	13/16	00	18	00
	14/17	00	18	45
	4	00	01	18
	19	00	00	12

					(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)		
(3)	Banaparia (Contd.)	16/20	00	00	10	Madhusudanpur	184	00	12	64	
		17/21	00	24	94	(Contd.)	183	00	12	70	
		18/22	00	00	16		186	00	07	48	
		19/23	00	17	01		187	00	04	54	
		31/36	00	00	21		188	00	00	80	
	Kurunia	1349	00	12	18		191	00	00	10	
		1347	00	00	10		192	00	00	84	
		1348	00	09	83		182	00	04	56	
		1350	00	14	15		193	00	12	31	
		1346	00	19	27		194	00	01	76	
		1343	00	03	54		230	00	08	58	
		1342	00	00	41		229	00	04	25	
		1352	00	10	06		231	00	08	33	
		1353	00	04	00		226	00	14	90	
		1354	00	05	81		234	00	00	79	
		1355	00	06	12		235	00	08	44	
		1356	00	04	37		236	00	34	10	
		1357	00	00	50		642	00	02	71	
		1324	00	04	81		242	00	00	68	
		1358	00	17	93		641	00	00	49	
		1323	00	00	17		633	00	00	62	
		1130	00	02	10		640	00	00	34	
		1127	00	02	34		616	00	10	77	
	1126	00	05	15		617	00	23	45		
	1125	00	00	12		619	00	05	68		
(4)	Kolatha	11/13	00	01	11		620	00	06	40	
		10/12	00	09	80		626	00	00	30	
		9/11	00	19	86		621	00	03	97	
		8/10	00	07	23		622	00	01	26	
		14	00	04	34		624	00	01	55	
		14/17	00	05	08		623	00	04	35	
		15/18	00	24	88		614	00	02	95	
		16/19	00	04	93		625	00	00	10	
		17/20	00	04	20		610	00	01	46	
		24/28	00	04	21		609	00	04	35	
		23/27	00	00	29		608	00	00	87	
		18/21	00	00	10		607	00	09	82	
		21/24	00	04	17		606	00	00	94	
		22/26	00	18	13		605	00	03	71	
		25	00	00	50		604	00	09	50	
							603	00	05	78	
							598	00	08	87	
	(5)	Madhusudanpur	151	00	01	20		602	00	06	05
			179	00	10	37		599	00	03	57

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Madhusudanpur	577	00	00	14	Bhansikharji	47	00	04	21
(Contd.)	600	00	00	10	(Contd.)	49	00	03	19
	560	00	00	88		48	00	02	52
	526	00	00	73		512	00	00	28
	527	00	05	05		50	00	01	84
	528	00	01	04		51	00	07	07
	529	00	01	27		53	00	00	15
	523	00	34	31		52	00	03	44
	520	00	12	69		54	00	00	16
	524	00	00	10		16/55	00	07	45
	723	00	05	40		17/56	00	05	50
(6) Chandatikiri	6	00	05	04	(8) Guhaldiha	360	00	00	24
	10	00	01	07		234	00	17	16
	9	00	00	80		236	00	12	13
	7	00	08	95		235	00	11	88
	4	00	00	10		514	00	02	61
	5	00	00	34		237	00	14	97
	8	00	05	73		230	00	00	22
	24	00	02	15		229	00	15	19
	1	00	26	41		224	00	06	83
	72	00	00	54		228	00	03	00
(7) Bhansikharji	1	00	10	96		226	00	00	32
	115	00	01	66		225	00	08	90
	114	00	04	72		163	00	08	38
	117	00	02	48		165	00	00	01
	113	00	03	46		167	00	07	87
	5/10	00	17	35		162	00	02	10
	4/9	00	12	12		142	00	02	37
	8	00	03	92		140	00	01	11
	13	00	00	10		141	00	10	42
	3/7	00	06	61		139	00	15	65
	22	00	06	23		137	00	10	13
	23	00	01	93		135	00	02	10
	6/24	00	06	45		136	00	01	17
	7/30	00	11	77		134	00	03	70
	9/32	00	07	13		128	00	00	27
	10/35	00	10	52		114	00	05	01
	29/87	00	01	95		113	00	00	68
	38	00	11	76		115	00	04	09
	83	00	15	80		112	00	09	40
	13/40	00	02	51		110	00	04	01
	2682	00	04	75		111	00	06	39
	43	00	01	57		104	00	10	66
	45	00	02	08		105	00	00	40
	46	00	01	78		106	00	02	57

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Guhaldiha (Contd.)	516	00	00	39	Syamraipur (Contd.)	63	00	04	98
	120	00	03	32		62	00	07	07
(9) Nadigan	1754	00	44	81		57	00	07	89
	1756	00	05	34		49	00	22	76
	1867	00	06	34		47	00	01	47
	1868	00	32	73		51	00	07	22
	1866	00	03	90		52	00	02	09
	1864	00	14	57	11. Sarasankha	905	00	09	24
	1858	00	09	98		842	00	01	68
	1859	00	02	30		787	00	10	38
	1860	00	00	23		782	00	05	53
	1857	00	08	80		783	00	09	25
	1856	00	01	34		784	00	00	50
	1861	00	14	22		786	00	03	61
	1855	00	02	08		785	00	04	27
	1837	00	03	61		778	00	03	83
	1836	00	14	60		792	00	07	09
	1835	00	08	76		768	00	04	12
	1937	00	01	69		770	00	00	63
	1834	00	07	91		769	00	04	69
	1833	00	12	08		767	00	02	59
	1832	00	10	19		771	00	00	10
	1829	00	00	10		766	00	20	32
	1827	00	00	29		722	00	19	73
	1828	00	08	03		723	00	04	95
	113	00	18	62		724	00	02	98
	114	00	05	19		2835	00	00	10
	105	00	03	40		717	00	02	13
10. Syamraipur	181	00	01	71		716	00	02	08
	182	00	16	45		715	00	02	57
	183	00	05	74		713	00	14	72
	184	00	03	77		711	00	00	52
	165	00	00	44		698	00	12	75
	164	00	16	34		2781	00	05	81
	163	00	02	36		702	00	05	08
	112	00	16	98		701	00	06	02
	115	00	04	55		700	00	00	27
	117	00	12	22		649	00	03	22
	116	00	20	72		645	00	02	38
	193	00	07	88		648	00	03	37
	69	00	00	20		651	00	09	44
	122	00	14	46		647	00	01	62
	68	00	23	68		2816	00	05	27
	66	00	11	18		634	00	04	48
	64	00	01	02		638	00	05	99

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
11. Sarasankha (Contd.)	639	00	03	81	Chahalima (Contd.)	586	00	01	94
	636	00	01	46		584	00	13	56
	637	00	08	51		585	00	07	28
	607	00	15	90		580	00	10	90
	604	00	06	51		579	00	02	99
	605	00	12	56		578	00	08	82
	606	00	01	75		577	00	04	75
	589	00	06	96		576	00	04	79
	588	00	03	49		575	00	02	63
	587	00	04	81		574	00	02	38
	575	00	10	15		570	00	07	33
	579	00	00	10		571	00	03	21
	576	00	17	19		568	00	04	37
	555	00	07	99		567	00	06	43
	559	00	05	93		566	00	04	49
	558	00	03	66		564	00	02	01
	556	00	13	12		565	00	08	68
	557	00	03	86	13. Kiamuendia	99	00	11	70
	552	00	01	49		13	00	09	14
	546	00	02	61		16	00	18	99
12. Chahalima	405	00	03	52		30	00	01	00
	407	00	14	35		8	00	00	32
	411	00	03	53		60	00	13	51
	410	00	14	10		15	00	01	17
	412	00	00	48		63	00	04	79
	717	00	12	23		52	00	10	41
	703	00	02	68		18	00	00	18
	704	00	00	39		19	00	00	83
	716	00	08	93		20	00	14	71
	705	00	11	52		58	00	00	88
	706	00	08	93		21	00	02	73
	693	00	05	47	14. Balipur	547	00	01	77
	676	00	21	15		514	00	00	10
	660	00	00	69		513	00	22	11
	661	00	10	02		518	00	06	88
	659	00	10	84		503	00	01	08
	665	00	00	18		499	00	14	20
	658	00	16	81		571	00	00	88
	596	00	02	07		497	00	03	68
	599	00	13	36		498	00	03	59
	598	00	02	48		522	00	03	39
	597	00	03	60		575	00	01	08
	600	00	00	77		410	00	02	06
	601	00	05	27		574	00	08	58
	587	00	13	11		489	00	21	15

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
14. Balipur (Contd.)	277	00	15	84	Rangapati (Contd.)	750	00	01	44
	261	00	48	06		749	00	04	91
	0	00	03	89		292	00	04	74
	244	00	05	87		26	00	02	46
	247	00	09	57		25	00	03	67
	557	00	00	21		24	00	05	05
	246	00	00	10		23	00	20	72
	Nala Bet Say	00	01	61		20	00	00	38
	No. 246 & VB					21	00	01	70
	101	00	24	56		22	00	03	99
15. Rangapati	100	00	19	13	16. Champo	13	00	00	10
	99	00	01	05		1	00	01	06
	78	00	05	63		61	00	06	64
	81	00	19	02		62	00	03	53
	80	00	04	37		63	00	00	36
	726	00	09	99		68	00	14	94
	727	00	00	31		69	00	01	64
	82	00	02	90		67	00	09	32
	83	00	27	93		70	00	11	94
	84	00	06	41		71	00	23	80
	85	00	04	05		72	00	00	19
	86	00	08	54		79	00	03	25
	130	00	03	78		53	00	02	87
	271	00	15	43		52	00	15	10
	272	00	07	18		50	00	02	18
	273	00	05	19		51	00	13	68
	270	00	01	09		48	00	15	99
	274	00	00	26		40	00	01	96
	275	00	04	73		39	00	02	55
	276	00	03	63		80	00	11	53
	277	00	00	58		144	00	16	81
	279	00	02	65		147	00	06	95
	280	00	09	23		149	00	08	83
	281	00	00	51		148	00	00	10
	282	00	00	10		151	00	01	37
	762	00	00	59		150	00	17	50
	283	00	00	30		161	00	02	47
	287	00	05	43		177	00	08	82
	761	00	03	09		162	00	12	33
	284	00	00	10		163	00	02	60
	752	00	03	75		165	00	18	23
	288	00	00	60		168	00	11	54
	751	00	02	29		170	00	00	15
	787	00	05	14		169	00	06	11
	748	00	00	52		171	00	12	59
						172	00	00	41

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
17. Angula	1492	00	05	14	Angula (Contd.)	1947	00	07	64
	1494	00	06	05		1945	00	00	10
	1493	00	05	92		1955	00	01	71
	1495	00	06	00		1956	00	01	50
	1505	00	02	44		1946	00	07	59
	1504	00	10	51		857	00	01	35
	1503	00	02	86		856	00	04	24
	1575	00	02	50		1957	00	06	49
	1576	00	03	15		854	00	11	89
	1788	00	00	46		853	00	00	58
	1789	00	02	00		852	00	04	60
	1804	00	03	89		855	00	01	80
	1790	00	03	02		850	00	00	17
	1805	00	00	10		851	00	07	58
	1803	00	01	12		847	00	11	47
	1791	00	00	11		848	00	02	70
	1802	00	12	05	18. Mantri	16	00	20	86
	1810	00	00	97		36	00	11	24
	1801	00	09	96		37	00	11	53
	1798	00	00	19		35	00	02	55
	1797	00	44	48		34	00	00	52
	1867	00	02	33		26	00	16	53
	1863	00	01	93		24	00	05	08
	2306	00	00	10		23	00	15	58
	1864	00	01	21		22	00	00	10
	1869	00	00	33		21	00	34	23
	1861	00	17	06		17	00	14	59
	1856	00	01	67		374	00	00	17
	1852	00	00	10		2579	00	03	44
	2087	00	13	78		377	00	10	82
	2090	00	09	29		380	00	01	52
	2093	00	03	15		379	00	19	06
	2089	00	11	17		378	00	07	63
	2085	00	15	85		408	00	47	66
	2082	00	05	74		981	00	01	94
	2081	00	05	49		1010	00	07	79
	2080	00	04	17		1011	00	06	65
	2079	00	16	87		1009	00	01	74
	2072	00	01	93		1008	00	04	32
	2073	00	20	29		1012	00	00	10
	1941	00	04	85		1007	00	04	36
	1943	00	00	34		1018	00	03	03
	1944	00	06	50		1006	00	08	93
	1948	00	09	70		1019	00	08	04
	1949	00	00	19		1025	00	00	77

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
18. Mantri (Contd.)	1022	00	05	16	Kesaripur (Contd)	2522	00	01	31
	1024	00	07	25		2599	00	07	69
	1023	00	03	02		2598	00	05	89
	1026	00	07	38		2601	00	05	89
19. Kesaripur	1913	00	01	06		2516	00	00	21
	1914	00	00	10		2604	00	05	20
	1915	00	26	42		2602	00	05	99
	1902	00	02	05		2603	00	04	68
	1903	00	00	54		2605	00	13	71
	1901	00	09	50		2606	00	07	66
	1884	00	03	78		2607	00	06	96
	1883	00	10	19		2613	00	08	16
	1879	00	00	10		2611	00	04	66
	1882	00	10	99		2612	00	00	16
	1891	00	06	88		2610	00	05	29
	1874	00	08	99		1208	00	02	01
	2820	00	01	17		1207	00	21	79
	2798	00	04	01		1155	00	00	77
	1873	00	01	01		1206	00	00	21
	1872	00	01	31		1202	00	12	36
	1871	00	00	76		1203	00	04	73
	1869	00	14	76		1201	00	18	59
	2014	00	04	72		1172	00	40	65
	2015	00	00	88					
	2013	00	12	60	In bet Suy No. 1172		00	27	68
	1986	00	00	49	and 1182				
	1985	00	00	49	1182	00	01	35	
	1992	00	00	52	1181	00	00	28	
	1987	00	44	84	1091	00	02	86	
	1988	00	04	69	1090	00	47	15	
	2004	00	08	82	1093	00	02	82	
	2024	00	00	66	1096	00	08	22	
	2003	00	11	87	1097	00	00	18	
	2002	00	05	63	20. Mahisasuri	170	00	02	30
	2534	00	12	22		169	00	13	13
	2535	00	04	20		168	00	03	76
	2536	00	08	96		167	00	02	02
	2533	00	00	54		166	00	04	43
	2537	00	05	99		137	00	22	77
	2538	00	04	68		138	00	01	27
	2540	00	12	17		118	00	10	26
	2543	00	01	81		120	00	08	92
	2542	00	07	37		123	00	00	93
	2544	00	07	21		103	00	00	10
	2545	00	02	89		124	00	04	29
						102	00	07	42

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
20. Mahisasuri (Contd.)	101	00	08	76	Chintamanipur	190	00	00	49
	126	00	00	34	(Contd.)	191	00	01	83
	95	00	28	36		482	00	08	79
	100	00	13	14		483	00	01	41
	96	00	02	43		487	00	03	41
Mandal/Tehsil/ :	District :	State :				512	00	02	33
Taluk : Nilagiri	Baleshwar	Orissa				488	00	02	73
(1) Iswarpur	565	00	06	97		490	00	01	17
	566	00	02	00		489	00	01	47
	567	00	02	33		491	00	06	51
	564	00	06	11		492	00	05	00
	559	00	02	88		415	00	01	20
	568	00	06	04		411	00	11	74
	570	00	00	24		414	00	10	58
	574	00	01	44		412	00	02	22
	572	00	03	87		413	00	07	89
	573	00	11	03		403	00	01	27
	576	00	01	07		404	00	11	13
	578	00	03	14		516	00	00	10
	577	00	02	06		405	00	01	60
	579	00	15	05		396	00	12	99
	542	00	03	55		397	00	05	94
	539	00	02	61		398	00	01	92
	538	00	03	93		399	00	01	66
	536	00	00	68		386	00	10	11
	537	00	13	22		387	00	04	24
	17	00	02	26		363	00	00	26
	21	00	00	47		535	00	04	62
	16	00	18	38	3. Kandagardi	1557	00	07	67
	15	00	00	31		1558	00	01	56
	4	00	02	13		1559	00	02	22
	5	00	00	58		1560	00	04	81
	3	00	02	74		1561	00	03	91
	1627	00	01	75		1562	00	05	66
	2	00	03	97		1542	00	18	07
	1	00	02	40		1540	00	00	10
	580	00	00	32		1541	00	02	17
2. Chintamanipur	176	00	03	00		3189	00	20	37
	175	00	27	06		1531	00	02	99
	181	00	01	76		1530	00	04	13
	182	00	01	57		1528	00	00	10
	183	00	02	65		1527	00	05	12
	187	00	00	10		1526	00	05	58
	189	00	02	06		1525	00	06	53
						1514	00	00	10

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Kandagardi (Contd.)	1515	00	04	52		Kanhupur (Contd.)	714	00	08	25	
	3262	00	08	81			680	00	03	03	
	1524	00	00	66			676	00	13	50	
	1516	00	17	35			715	00	06	28	
	1487	00	00	66			663	00	06	19	
	2415	00	04	80			661	00	09	76	
	1486	00	05	70			660	00	05	41	
	2416	00	07	41			636	00	00	21	
	1484	00	03	68			659	00	18	11	
	2427	00	04	89			643	00	06	96	
	2426	00	01	13			644	00	00	10	
	2434	00	05	53			642	00	16	38	
	2425	00	00	67			641	00	02	21	
	2435	00	02	81			469	00	03	17	
	2436	00	00	48			468	00	03	86	
	1478	00	03	09			470	00	04	65	
	1474	00	04	23			471	00	00	28	
	1475	00	00	40			434	00	07	81	
	1473	00	03	32			444	00	02	27	
	1472	00	07	00			445	00	00	55	
	1471	00	02	68			856	00	01	20	
	1470	00	08	54			443	00	00	86	
	1442	00	04	05			442	00	01	85	
	1443	00	01	09			446	00	01	87	
	1444	00	00	81			437	00	00	38	
	1441	00	09	28			441	00	05	50	
	1445	00	00	10			440	00	02	23	
	1373	00	07	38			438	00	01	72	
	1372	00	00	10			439	00	01	22	
	1374	00	00	69			421	00	04	39	
	1379	00	04	04			420	00	04	86	
	1385	00	00	10			419	00	02	02	
	1380	00	03	19			422	00	00	10	
	1381	00	07	27			394	00	08	64	
	1382	00	04	95			412	00	02	62	
	1383	00	02	69			410	00	00	67	
	1384	00	00	76			411	00	14	58	
4 Kanhupur	In bet V.B. of	00	01	59			405	00	15	70	
	Kandagardi and						404	00	02	35	
	V.B. of						406	00	00	92	
	696	00	04	60			398	00	00	10	
	703	00	09	15			402	00	03	06	
	711	00	14	57			401	00	07	78	
	712	00	00	10		(5) Koligadi	817	00	02	32	
	710	00	05	69			807	00	00	10	
	713	00	09	20			816	00	14	78	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Koligadi (Contd.)	821	00	00	10	Khadipada (Contd.)	35	00	07	77
	815	00	25	23		30	00	08	13
	822	00	00	25		21	00	03	90
	823	00	03	47		22	00	04	41
	814	00	04	05		29	00	01	42
	994	00	01	21		23	00	06	24
	995	00	11	18		24	00	08	04
	562	00	09	12		25	00	15	47
	561	00	07	86	(8) Jokagadia	996	00	01	75
	564	00	00	45		995	00	00	27
	559	00	00	95		993	00	11	61
	560	00	04	10		988	00	16	00
	555	00	01	37		987	00	01	11
	558	00	01	46		990	00	01	15
	557	00	00	68		989	00	19	12
	556	00	06	48	(9) Astia	290	00	01	91
	553	00	00	18		291	00	00	10
	538	00	00	28		292	00	00	12
	449	00	01	88		328	00	00	28
	450	00	08	42		327	00	08	38
	447	00	08	54		298	00	04	55
	446	00	11	51		299	00	00	10
	442	00	06	64		300	00	01	36
	441	00	16	57		302	00	00	73
	436	00	00	38		301	00	03	58
	440	00	04	34		326	00	04	31
	439	00	00	55		325	00	00	51
	438	00	08	79		303	00	24	58
(6) Huntapoor	21	00	02	58		311	00	00	10
	379	00	13	37		312	00	02	73
	412	00	01	02		315	00	00	64
	397	00	00	25		314	00	10	88
	20	00	02	82		313	00	13	24
	413	00	09	64		213	00	05	06
	19	00	00	42		208	00	03	04
	16	00	05	66		209	00	01	58
	15	00	04	70		210	00	00	13
(7) Khadipada	310	00	04	95		212	00	01	94
	37	00	10	83		573	00	03	04
	36	00	16	30		35	00	00	71
	17	00	00	19		57	00	09	03
	33	00	03	90		58	00	05	01
	34	00	14	75		59	00	02	15
	20	00	01	15		60	00	01	77

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Astia (Contd.)	61	00	07	70	Khirapada (Contd.)	30	00	34	65
	99	00	20	22		6	00	11	51
	64	00	01	24		5	00	07	52
	98	00	25	01		4	00	01	31
	97	00	00	10	(2) Rapaetpur	1120	00	08	24
	106	00	09	03		1121	00	00	59
	107	00	18	55		1122	00	04	41
	123	00	01	19		1095	00	14	56
	984	00	00	10		1094	00	27	18
	122	00	16	75		1096	00	00	27
	109	00	00	10		1093	00	01	38
	983	00	06	15		1092	00	00	15
	121	00	04	30		1091	00	12	90
	120	00	03	53		1089	00	05	89
	119	00	01	45		1090	00	08	87
	116	00	04	34		1088	00	01	68
	115	00	20	30		1087	00	07	56
						1086	00	07	12
Mandal/Tehsil/ Taluk : Khaira	District : Baleshwar	State : Orissa				1085	00	00	27
(1) Khirapada	127	00	00	95		1040	00	02	53
	124	00	31	35		1039	00	04	61
	110	00	00	10		1038	00	05	31
	109	00	01	17		1037	00	09	34
	108	00	02	25		1128	00	01	39
	107	00	00	44	(3) Durgapur	7	00	03	02
	102	00	01	17		62	00	02	54
	1	00	00	23		61	00	02	57
	58	00	06	65		60	00	02	74
	59	00	04	50		59	00	04	89
	60	00	00	10		64	00	00	10
	66	00	00	88		56	00	00	83
	67	00	05	31		57	00	01	71
	68	00	02	61		54	00	00	10
	69	00	00	27		53	00	05	05
	70	00	08	39		58	00	08	28
	57	00	00	10		46	00	02	69
	1077	00	20	43		43	00	07	15
	72	00	00	39		45	00	06	37
	56	00	06	06		44	00	00	95
	52	00	01	18		12	00	10	60
	51	00	19	26		15	00	23	90
	45	00	06	36		14	00	01	06
	44	00	07	51		17	00	11	14
	37	00	00	10					
	36	00	06	12					
	32	00	00	10					
	31	00	02	40					

नई दिल्ली, 28 फरवरी, 2011

का. आ. 728.—भारत सरकार को लोकहित में यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स रिलाएन्स इंडस्ट्रीज लिमिटेड के आन्ध्र प्रदेश में पूर्वी तट पर ऑनशोर टर्मिनल से देश के विभिन्न हिस्सों में उपभोक्ताओं तक प्राकृतिक गैस के परिवहन के लिए, मैसर्स रिलोजिस्टिक्स इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर लिमिटेड द्वारा काकीनाडा बासुदेवपुर-हावड़ा पाइपलाइन" बिछाई जानी चाहिए;

और भारत सरकार को उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि, उस भूमि में, जिसके भीतर उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाई जाने का प्रस्ताव है और जो इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित है, उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाए;

अतः अब, भारत सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उनमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आदेश की घोषणा करती है;

कोई व्यक्ति, जो उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध है, उस तारीख से जिसको उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन जारी की गई अधिसूचना की प्रतियां साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती हैं, इक्कीस दिन के भीतर भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार के अर्जन के संबंध में श्री भास्कर त्रिपाठी, सक्षम प्राधिकारी, रिलोजिस्टिक्स इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर लिमिटेड, प्रथम मंजिल, फोर्चुन टावर, चन्द्रशेखरपुर, भुवनेश्वर-751023, ओडिशा राज्य को लिखित रूप में आक्षेप भेज सकेगा।

अनुसूची

मंडल/तहसील/तालुक : जिला : भद्रक		राज्य : ओडिशा		
भद्रक देहात				
गाँव का नाम	सर्वे सं./ सब डिविजन	आर. ओ. यू. अर्जित करने के लिए क्षेत्रफल		
	सं.	हेक्टेयर	एयर	सि एयर
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1. दाइसिंग	1180	00	01	35
	1181	00	06	00
	1179	00	17	60
	1178	00	29	01
	1176	00	00	47
	1175	00	04	97
	1086	00	10	40
	1068	00	35	24
	1085	00	12	30
	1081	00	17	41
	1078	00	11	99
	1075	00	00	62

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1. दाइसिंग (निरंतर)	1076	00	09	55
	1074	00	01	14
	1073	00	00	50
	1077	00	07	79
	1025	00	01	75
सर्वे सं. 1025 और 1026 के बीच में	00	00		64
	1026	00	05	51
	1024	00	05	44
	1021	00	02	88
	1020	00	00	43
	1022	00	15	69
	968	00	18	70
	1034	00	00	20
	1035	00	02	57
	1036	00	09	93
	944	00	03	91
	1037	00	02	13
	943	00	01	17
	942	00	04	36
	941	00	02	19
	940	00	00	10
	905	00	20	12
	904	00	00	97
	901	00	00	10
	906	00	05	86
	907	00	05	85
	908	00	02	44
	909	00	09	73
	911	00	00	13
	870	00	04	48
	876	00	00	23
	873	00	01	54
	874	00	02	33
	871	00	02	23
	872	00	05	16
	868	00	00	10
	878	00	04	93
	879	00	06	70
	882	00	01	78
	880	00	14	12
	858	00	02	83
	857	00	06	31
	853	00	10	91
	852	00	04	62
	851	00	03	46

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
सूचिका (संख्या)	860	00	00	29	1. अलसुआ-जारी	660	00	00	89
	850	00	05	72		659	00	13	01
	849	00	10	71		664	00	11	25
	848	00	18	10		663	00	02	61
	846	00	12	64		674	00	08	02
	806	00	11	79		676	00	05	58
	844	00	00	12		673	00	03	13
	805	00	00	38		672	00	12	09
	843	00	06	26		680	00	00	21
	807	00	18	19		681	00	00	29
	808	00	04	00		682	00	11	30
	809	00	17	25		694	00	18	10
	468	00	00	82		692	00	09	78
	811	00	00	43		693	00	01	24
	810	00	03	26		691	00	00	58
	812	00	00	35		686	00	02	48
	463	00	10	04		685	00	00	87
	462	00	12	90		687	00	05	42
	461	00	07	12		584	00	22	41
	460	00	13	29		1049	00	09	25
	458	00	01	14		1056	00	02	40
	421	00	13	69		1050	00	03	51
	457	00	01	25		1051	00	04	77
	428	00	14	92		1052	00	00	82
	427	00	01	33		1055	00	00	10
	426	00	02	27		1054	00	03	09
	429	00	21	48		1053	00	14	43
	481	00	00	11		1062	00	01	66
	435	00	10	17		1650	00	19	61
	436	00	05	22		1047	00	00	48
	439	00	00	10		1072	00	01	42
	438	00	08	49		1075	00	02	97
	437	00	01	57		1073	00	00	22
						1076	00	11	66
						1078	00	09	16
						1085	00	14	56
						1087	00	03	77
						1088	00	08	07
						सर्वे सं. 1088	00	07	08
						और 1089 के			
						बीच में			
						1089	00	04	06
						1090	00	01	78
						1448	00	00	10
						1449	00	04	45
						1447	00	07	80

नोट/अलसुआ-जारी : सर्वे बिना बालरवर राज्य : ओडिशा

1. अलसुआ	761	00	00	35
	760	00	11	33
	646	00	00	53
	647	00	10	82
	648	00	09	40
	649	00	09	36
	650	00	06	15
	651	00	07	58
	652	00	08	47
	657	00	14	95
	658	00	00	51
	659	00	06	21

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
अलसुआ—जारी	1446	00	06	92	राउलखुंटा—जारी	96	00	00	19
	1451	00	01	54		94	00	00	87
	1458	00	13	93		93	00	14	70
	1456	00	07	46		91	00	01	40
	1459	00	06	60		92	00	04	17
	1508	00	08	95		90	00	02	05
	1509	00	26	70		87	00	04	80
	1515	00	00	81		86	00	05	86
	1514	00	03	34		85	00	15	06
	1510	00	13	03		84	00	00	49
	1511	00	06	02		83	00	08	26
	1503	00	11	87		80	00	05	69
	1512	00	12	35		79	00	10	34
	1513	00	03	83		78	00	10	74
	1496	00	00	10		77	00	02	67
	1547	00	16	72		76	00	17	66
	1548	00	14	45		66	00	01	58
	1549	00	21	04		67	00	16	16
	1550	00	02	08		68	00	00	82
	1551	00	03	76		60	00	03	86
	1553	00	10	08		59	00	11	15
	1552	00	01	31		58	00	00	94
मंडल/तहसील/तालुक : निलगिरी जिला बालेश्वर राज्य : ओडिशा						56	00	11	28
1. द्वारिका	1546	00	00	14		55	00	22	52
	1547	00	02	60		39	00	07	51
	1548	00	02	79		38	00	03	86
	1545	00	03	35		40	00	20	04
	1544	00	02	39		41	00	19	10
	1552	00	07	38		42	00	07	07
	1557	00	03	48		43	00	01	91
	1553	00	01	63		45	00	07	66
	1556	00	03	89	3. श्यामसुंदरपुर	2141	00	10	96
	2011	00	05	72		2142	00	01	49
	1563	00	02	42		2138	00	02	62
	1562	00	06	49		2137	00	01	99
	1567	00	03	84		2135	00	08	32
	1654	00	11	96		3248	00	00	10
	1647	00	02	02		2133	00	00	87
	1648	00	17	97		2132	00	09	25
	1645	00	03	60		2233	00	00	64
	1642	00	04	96		2235	00	11	69
	1636	00	04	00		2234	00	16	09
	1635	00	00	38		3245	00	03	56
	1634	00	09	06		2230	00	01	02
2. राउलखुंटा	99	00	00	10		2239	00	01	72
	95	00	20	95		3246	00	05	39

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
श्यामसुंदरपुर (जारी)	2229	00	09	67	कंठीयाटिकर (जारी)	387	00	01	38
	2228	00	06	60		388	00	00	89
	3256	00	06	56		386	00	06	61
	2227	00	15	37		723	00	11	18
	2579	00	00	10		385	00	07	18
	2508	00	02	13		379	00	04	62
	2480	00	00	10		381	00	00	31
	2509	00	11	58		380	00	14	68
	2507	00	09	12		377	00	00	10
	2506	00	03	12		376	00	17	89
	2486	00	00	10		588	00	04	37
	2489	00	00	26		375	00	06	64
	2505	00	07	85		589	00	03	20
	2513	00	00	21		590	00	13	31
	2502	00	03	96		597	00	00	10
	2504	00	00	10		592	00	02	81
	2503	00	03	60		596	00	03	74
	2500	00	03	85		598	00	02	85
	2501	00	05	94		599	00	01	28
	2498	00	07	52		595	00	00	10
	2497	00	11	76		600	00	12	80
	2496	00	00	25		628	00	06	65
	2517	00	14	01		601	00	04	42
	2419	00	03	89		627	00	05	11
	3218	00	03	73		629	00	02	62
	3217	00	01	25		634	00	12	29
	3266	00	01	58		632	00	00	51
	2414	00	04	99		633	00	15	36
	2413	00	02	40		636	00	02	20
	2412	00	01	86		635	00	02	69
	2518	00	10	11		705	00	05	59
	3064	00	06	85		637	00	00	10
	2525	00	00	46	5. कंठीपद	505	00	05	20
	2519	00	06	89		149	00	03	87
कंठीयाटिकर	447	00	05	07		150	00	10	50
	435	00	01	52		151	00	01	86
	446	00	01	38		167	00	06	94
	436	00	07	03		166	00	04	76
	445	00	01	05		180	00	04	35
	437	00	02	91		165	00	01	92
	438	00	12	19		179	00	01	15
	439	00	00	48		181	00	03	21
	444	00	16	78		182	00	06	12
	532	00	08	89		190	00	01	68
	721	00	02	46		193	00	00	10
	720	00	06	40		191	00	06	88

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
कंठीपद (जारी)	189	00	08	33	टनका (जारी)	773	00	00	10
	188	00	06	33		1074	00	00	82
	202	00	05	07		770	00	02	96
	200	00	00	91		771	00	01	63
	201	00	07	96		772	00	00	64
6. दक्षिणकुआँरपुर	246	00	00	56		474	00	00	52
	270	00	08	63		476	00	03	83
	247	00	02	00		475	00	12	11
	245	00	03	41		485	00	17	27
	244	00	05	54		484	00	00	69
	243	00	09	85		486	00	04	35
	236	00	06	05		488	00	00	65
	242	00	08	77		487	00	04	00
	141	00	02	27		490	00	04	99
7. गोबर्धनपुर	211	00	08	02		489	00	03	77
	210	00	04	14		491	00	02	14
	250	00	03	38		493	00	02	88
	196	00	00	30		492	00	02	39
	209	00	00	36		483	00	02	97
	197	00	13	70		496	00	02	86
	198	00	03	33		494	00	04	36
	206	00	00	10		495	00	06	66
	199	00	05	42		498	00	00	28
	192	00	00	58		499	00	00	43
	191	00	04	98		500	00	03	42
	172	00	08	01		501	00	00	41
	173	00	01	56		447	00	09	31
	171	00	00	10		444	00	01	89
	174	00	04	15		512	00	03	61
	154	00	01	84		513	00	08	31
	175	00	00	84		523	00	11	81
	142	00	07	03		525	00	13	00
	153	00	06	13		522	00	07	40
	152	00	08	62		521	00	05	17
	156	00	02	99		527	00	00	70
	143	00	03	17		534	00	09	22
	144	00	12	07		685	00	12	52
	145	00	00	55		535	00	00	10
	123	00	08	98		683	00	03	54
	120	00	13	01		682	00	11	65
	118	00	00	09		681	00	07	75
	146	00	03	46		673	00	00	10
8. टनका	1071	00	05	84		680	00	04	42
	1073	00	19	00		675	00	00	68
	1072	00	07	18		676	00	02	95
						677	00	02	74
						674	00	04	06

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
9. प्रतापदा	76	00	04	31	बडाता (जारी)	698	00	01	24
	68	00	10	61		658	00	01	16
	67	00	09	79		660	00	03	04
	66	00	12	50		659	00	13	13
	65	00	03	01		653	00	05	42
	72	00	01	65		651	00	05	10
	52	00	00	76		652	00	15	47
	50	00	30	22		648	00	15	62
	49	00	02	30		650	00	00	40
	48	00	01	20		649	00	15	25
	606	00	10	66		598	00	02	43
10. नरसिंहपुर	1838	00	10	55		585	00	05	19
	358	00	02	56		596	00	18	91
	357	00	02	44		589	00	05	25
	356	00	05	11		590	00	07	57
	355	00	11	52		592	00	01	22
	352	00	00	97		591	00	06	68
	353	00	04	50		543	00	21	47
	354	00	21	93		502	00	08	17
	318	00	03	78		544	00	13	25
	319	00	09	57		498	00	11	24
	320	00	02	86		497	00	00	10
	347	00	00	25		496	00	01	40
	321	00	02	95		495	00	06	27
	322	00	00	92		553	00	00	48
11. नंदमोहपात्राब्रेह	32	00	03	61		494	00	05	85
	31	00	10	78		492	00	12	78
	30	00	07	14		491	00	10	22
	29	00	00	13		490	00	03	81
	36	00	06	01		493	00	01	54
	28	00	18	36		476	00	11	41
	3	00	00	99		477	00	00	39
12. बडाता	686	00	07	92		474	00	02	92
	687	00	09	00		475	00	03	68
	688	00	03	82		471	00	03	62
	708	00	21	80		470	00	05	94
	712	00	01	76		469	00	01	63
	711	00	09	40		299	00	00	24
	709	00	22	77		300	00	06	94
	710	00	00	19		298	00	02	25
	707	00	01	75		301	00	03	17
	695	00	00	10		296	00	06	64
	706	00	08	90		303	00	00	74
	697	00	04	21		304	00	03	11
	696	00	06	78		305	00	01	97
	661	00	09	74		307	00	02	32

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
बडाता (जारी)	306	00	02	86	दुलारपुर (जारी)	106	00	05	31
	308	00	04	18		111	00	08	37
	293	00	06	97		113	00	04	94
	238	00	05	39		110	00	08	80
	772	00	06	36		114	00	00	74
	239	00	01	91		133	00	08	77
	230	00	05	48		132	00	01	53
	240	00	05	71		135	00	09	06
	241	00	05	41		162	00	04	09
	123	00	00	68		163	00	10	54
	242	00	07	14		164	00	00	39
	118	00	09	19		165	00	13	72
	116	00	02	22		168	00	04	96
	115	00	04	16		169	00	02	71
	114	00	03	15		175	00	01	21
	113	00	04	57		174	00	02	07
	109	00	05	75		170	00	00	89
	110	00	13	12		173	00	01	38
	111	00	00	13		172	00	03	67
	108	00	00	10		187	00	02	07
	750	00	05	13		186	00	01	32
	58	00	02	02		185	00	26	24
	59	00	24	53		199	00	00	64
	62	00	00	66		200	00	02	07
	61	00	07	00		201	00	03	18
	60	00	05	33		395	00	02	13
	70	00	05	12	2. गिरिनीपुर	386	00	01	90
	71	00	10	18		322	00	02	34
	72	00	09	42		401	00	05	19
	73	00	03	62		323	00	04	34
						326	00	14	20
						400	00	04	18
						398	00	04	22
						339	00	08	65
						329	00	03	68
						331	00	01	97
						332	00	03	01
						333	00	05	12
						334	00	06	72
						360	00	13	39
						361	00	09	30
						357	00	05	15
						335	00	10	57
						354	00	10	71
						356	00	00	10
						353	00	00	22
मंडल/तहसील/तालुक : छौरा जिला बालेश्वर राज्य : ओडिसा									
1. दुलारपुर	310	00	06	55					
	312	00	00	53					
	309	00	04	92					
	308	00	31	32					
	319	00	16	51					
	323	00	04	36					
	324	00	05	00					
	325	00	00	10					
	288	00	02	87					
	93	00	00	95					
	102	00	05	03					
	104	00	03	80					
	105	00	00	85					
	101	00	00	65					
	103	00	05	15					

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
मिदिनीपुर (जारी)	347	00	15	67	अनंतपुर (जारी)	317	00	01	72
	352	00	07	11		24	00	00	42
	350	00	03	97		16	00	07	18
	351	00	00	96		20	00	14	80
	366	00	06	60		21	00	04	58
	387	00	01	46	4. तारंग	223	00	00	58
	288	00	02	60		221	00	01	36
	367	00	13	11		222	00	01	98
	368	00	01	06		229	00	02	30
	369	00	08	81		220	00	07	28
	274	00	00	45		219	00	00	40
	273	00	07	01		217	00	03	02
	272	00	09	86		216	00	29	27
	270	00	04	25		215	00	03	30
3. अनंतपुर	75	00	09	23		156	00	08	22
	76	00	12	92		157	00	03	65
	74	00	01	51		148	00	00	23
	77	00	06	70		147	00	04	22
	78	00	07	17		158	00	26	61
	80	00	05	87		139	00	03	33
	71	00	07	76		138	00	07	32
	70	00	01	91		137	00	01	70
	47	00	02	52		136	00	14	67
	100	00	00	20		1719	00	00	63
	101	00	02	26		119	00	10	51
	69	00	07	66		117	00	10	98
	48	00	07	34		118	00	04	20
	49	00	05	89		1722	00	01	06
	325	00	03	21		124	00	02	32
	53	00	00	12		72	00	00	28
	52	00	01	86		71	00	14	67
	54	00	02	80		66	00	11	79
	51	00	04	79		65	00	00	02
सर्वे सं. 51	00	08	20			64	00	01	07
और 57 के						75	00	02	45
बीच में						63	00	05	73
57	00	02	53			58	00	01	28
33	00	00	74			79	00	00	21
318	00	04	31			62	00	02	10
23	00	00	90			80	00	00	07
29	00	04	80			81	00	03	64
28	00	01	32			61	00	04	47
27	00	02	51			33	00	02	19
26	00	00	55			32	00	11	20
25	00	02	22			34	00	01	04
319	00	02	56			40	00	07	64

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
5. कासिदिपुर	410	00	06	14	हात्तौरी (जारी)	75	00	00	21
	411	00	05	55		885	00	01	16
	421	00	02	06		74	00	04	58
	420	00	19	52		70	00	01	31
	414	00	06	25		71	00	02	66
	418	00	00	44		73	00	03	46
	419	00	03	51		72	00	00	36
	423	00	00	10		2	00	03	67
	288	00	25	47		1	00	04	05
	279	00	11	82	2. कुंडी	1166	00	01	57
	271	00	00	22		1165	00	05	40
	273	00	05	65		1160	00	01	98
	202	00	00	35		1161	00	01	01
	267	00	01	66		1162	00	01	17
	270	00	02	32		1163	00	00	18
मंडल/तहसील/तालुक : सिमिलिया जिला बालेश्वर राज्य : ओडिशा						1154	00	00	97
1. हात्तौरी	439	00	06	35		1156	00	00	69
	907	00	12	69		1155	00	01	17
	8	00	00	50		1150	00	00	27
	9	00	02	77		1144	00	01	45
	44	00	03	19		1145	00	01	54
	45	00	01	39		1149	00	00	10
	46	00	00	32		1146	00	01	14
	42	00	02	11		1148	00	00	08
	43	00	01	69		1143	00	02	84
	10	00	00	99		1147	00	03	37
	11	00	00	10		1135	00	00	44
	894	00	01	48		1142	00	00	10
	14	00	03	38		1138	00	04	20
	47	00	00	22		1137	00	01	41
	41	00	07	74		1140	00	02	38
	40	00	09	20		1139	00	01	88
	16	00	01	78		1136	00	00	48
	39	00	06	06		1127	00	03	54
	37	00	00	56		1128	00	04	35
	38	00	03	92		1129	00	01	79
	57	00	00	49		1130	00	00	77
	56	00	00	10		1126	00	01	48
	58	00	04	12		1125	00	00	51
	35	00	00	74		1124	00	11	29
	62	00	01	84		1122	00	00	10
	61	00	03	10		1123	00	03	27
	63	00	00	18	3. सबंग	178	00	00	12
	60	00	00	82		163	00	12	69
	64	00	12	61		1544	00	03	50
	76	00	02	48		164	00	02	20

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
सर्ग (जारी)	165	00	12	78	सर्ग (जारी)	483	00	03	15
	168	00	01	29		482	00	01	37
	166	00	12	46		479	00	00	10
	167	00	00	78		474	00	04	01
	154	00	04	02		476	00	04	03
	153	00	09	97		475	00	04	02
	149	00	06	81		477	00	04	27
	151	00	01	38		469	00	01	20
	150	00	02	76		468	00	03	69
	147	00	16	88		478	00	00	39
	146	00	00	10		2489	00	03	69
	145	00	05	73		465	00	03	42
	143	00	01	19		467	00	00	10
	306	00	13	07		466	00	03	57
	307	00	02	15		2487	00	00	20
	308	00	13	13		464	00	02	49
	309	00	01	33		806	00	02	11
	318	00	06	31		808	00	13	89
	320	00	00	40		809	00	00	29
	317	00	00	16		810	00	07	61
	319	00	05	74		2542	00	00	10
	326	00	00	10		811	00	01	59
	327	00	02	98		819	00	07	87
	328	00	04	66		2522	00	00	47
	329	00	03	22		812	00	00	62
	332	00	07	62		818	00	06	44
	330	00	00	45		824	00	00	25
	331	00	21	65		817	00	13	61
	363	00	01	19		816	00	02	24
	527	00	00	34		835	00	04	11
	495	00	14	85		833	00	00	78
	494	00	02	31		834	00	03	85
	496	00	09	01		836	00	02	51
	493	00	02	06		839	00	00	24
	492	00	00	19		837	00	02	19
	526	00	01	97		838	00	03	02
	497	00	09	54		840	00	00	96
	491	00	01	97	4. महमदपुर	1086	00	00	16
	498	00	06	25		1092	00	07	49
	499	00	04	99		1093	00	07	20
	487	00	01	14		1091	00	00	17
	506	00	00	60		1094	00	02	40
	486	00	10	22		1097	00	00	10
	485	00	01	90		1095	00	04	84
	484	00	04	02		1096	00	02	02
	473	00	00	51		1101	00	00	67

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
महमदपुर (जारी)	1089	00	01	68	महमदपुर (जारी)	986	00	05	51
	1103	00	01	89		991	00	00	46
	1102	00	05	18		981	00	00	10
	1104	00	00	27		983	00	02	27
	1107	00	02	06		985	00	00	45
	1108	00	03	95		982	00	00	84
	1127	00	00	11		984	00	09	13
	1109	00	00	81		914	00	08	30
	1112	00	16	86		1640	00	07	03
	1125	00	01	52		913	00	06	36
	1124	00	00	16		915	00	00	24
	1113	00	01	02		1639	00	06	12
	1117	00	00	10		912	00	06	29
	1121	00	07	98		1638	00	06	35
	1120	00	02	61		910	00	00	74
	1119	00	02	51		909	00	04	30
	1122	00	09	33		819	00	00	93
	1137	00	00	34		908	00	10	52
	1118	00	02	36		820	00	00	71
	1044	00	00	57		907	00	07	06
	1042	00	06	05		1633	00	04	20
	1041	00	05	14		821	00	02	29
	1040	00	00	32		899	00	07	01
	1043	00	00	35		822	00	01	47
	1037	00	05	09		898	00	11	05
	1039	00	04	16		895	00	00	52
	1027	00	00	52		897	00	00	25
	1038	00	02	00		896	00	14	56
	1029	00	02	51		894	00	00	52
	1028	00	00	10		890	00	01	40
	1031	00	00	14		1651	00	03	69
	1030	00	03	90		856	00	00	35
	1024	00	04	31		857	00	10	27
	1023	00	03	41		889	00	09	48
	1022	00	01	16		887	00	08	06
	1170	00	07	25		885	00	06	33
	1171	00	08	60		884	00	03	23
	1172	00	05	74		881	00	10	39
	996	00	02	95		878	00	10	51
	995	00	02	41		877	00	11	78
	994	00	03	33		1331	00	00	88
	993	00	03	72		1334	00	00	68
	988	00	00	44		873	00	05	19
	992	00	01	81		1336	00	01	35
	989	00	04	69		1335	00	02	90
	990	00	03	42		1340	00	00	10

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
महमदपुर (जारी)	872	00	01	27	आनन्दपुर (जारी)	430	00	01	80
	1337	00	00	54		421	00	02	16
	867	00	03	86		471	00	02	13
	1338	00	12	77		422	00	02	53
	866	00	01	56		429	00	05	25
	1339	00	01	32		428	00	00	10
5. आनन्दपुर	77	00	08	88		423	DO	01	02
	78	00	01	02		426	00	00	10
	85	00	13	75		470	00	02	34
	532	00	00	10		472	00	01	01
	531	00	02	64		468	00	02	22
	84	00	00	48		425	00	01	07
	530	00	08	19		467	00	01	04
	86	00	04	32		466	00	05	48
	87	00	01	03		440	00	00	10
	90	00	00	10		461	00	11	44
	529	00	08	65		462	00	00	62
	523	00	00	32		460	00	01	51
	528	00	04	51		459	00	18	89
	91	00	00	10		2213	00	51	48
	527	00	02	47		2111	00	26	58
	526	00	11	24		351	00	03	54
	206	00	08	33	मंडल/तहसील/तालुक : बस्ता जिला बालेश्वर राज्य : ओडिशा				
	209	00	01	16	1. देउलपडा गांव सीमा		00	05	91
	208	00	05	92	और सर्वे सं 45				
	210	00	06	76	के बीच में				
	207	00	00	12		45	00	00	90
	391	00	00	15		72	00	36	75
	211	00	05	72		98	00	15	42
	390	00	03	11		99	00	24	75
	212	00	02	58		302	00	02	85
	213	00	00	82		100	00	05	12
	389	00	09	05		123	00	00	24
	388	00	00	06		125	00	02	34
	387	00	03	75		124	00	05	72
	385	00	03	64	2. बाउंसमुखा	319	00	04	47
	384	00	00	18		315	00	04	36
	386	00	07	15		318	00	01	10
	414	00	02	72		316	00	01	72
	415	00	06	33		317	00	08	80
	417	00	00	10		314	00	11	04
	416	00	04	29		324	00	01	27
	418	00	01	10		325	00	00	71
	419	00	01	14		398	00	04	72
	420	00	00	79		399	00	07	77
	431	00	00	67		397	00	00	86
						400	00	01	94

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
बारेंसमुखा (जारी)	402	00	02	11	बारमाडिआ (समाप्त)	102/699	00	07	86
	393	00	05	81		101/698	00	02	46
	404	00	03	74		100/697	00	08	60
	405	00	01	70		97/694	00	00	28
	403	00	02	87		99/696	00	09	09
	406	00	01	64		66/662	00	00	10
	389	00	00	10		98/695	00	03	49
	407	00	09	71		94/691	00	00	32
	411	00	00	13		69/65	00	02	23
	410	00	02	09		70/66	00	04	58
	408	00	03	13		71/67	00	08	96
	409	00	06	73		91/687	00	00	30
	490	00	00	10		8/842	00	00	38
	491	00	00	73		73/69	00	02	88
	487	00	00	43		76/672	00	06	89
	492	00	11	52		90/686	00	01	59
	493	00	13	98		75/671	00	00	12
	494	00	00	80		60/656	00	02	00
	497	00	03	76		77/673	00	10	66
	498	00	03	60		81/677	00	00	48
	499	00	03	62		78/674	00	02	13
	506	00	01	67		80/676	00	05	54
	507	00	05	65		184/857	00	04	19
	505	00	00	37		79/675	00	00	96
	508	00	02	26	5. गोबर्धनपुर	1	00	23	38
	509	00	00	10		4	00	00	14
	504	00	15	18	6. मधुमंड	12	00	03	68
3. निलावरपुर	9	00	09	69		1	00	18	21
	8	00	01	76		5	00	03	62
	7	00	03	98		4	00	00	24
	6	00	09	78		2	00	11	79
	11	00	01	52		3	00	13	66
	5	00	00	13		22	00	04	03
	12	00	09	21		23	00	01	08
	29	00	03	40	मंडल/तहसील/तालुक: जालेश्वर जिला : बालेश्वर राज्य: ओडिशा				
	14	00	04	28	1. किस्मत् गोबर्धनपुर	136	00	02	81
	13	00	07	24		143	00	09	40
	15	00	10	89		142	00	01	34
	17	00	03	19		141	00	01	64
	16	00	02	91		144	00	00	53
	18	00	00	38		146	00	01	59
4. बारमाडिआ	104/702	00	08	66		147	00	08	49
	103/701	00	09	43		149	00	01	02
	105/703	00	04	31		148	00	06	45
	106/704	00	01	44		158	00	00	33
	700	00	01	87					

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
किस्मत गोबर्धनपुर	151	00	00	56	2. चकाघु (समाप्त)	128	00	00	72
(समाप्त)	157	00	06	11		119	00	02	82
	161	00	00	10		120	00	03	95
	156	00	12	43		121	00	01	98
	207	00	00	10		118	00	08	29
	206	00	02	96		122	00	00	29
	155	00	01	34		117	00	15	08
	272	00	01	44		192	00	02	49
	171	00	01	49		193	00	02	71
	173	00	06	96		219	00	15	34
	176	00	04	43		220	00	04	52
	174	00	00	36		218	00	01	13
	175	00	08	94		221	00	08	29
	187	00	02	30		225	00	00	10
	198	00	01	41		223	00	06	01
	112	00	00	59		224	00	23	57
	111	00	01	53		205	00	00	45
	109	00	04	84		204	00	03	86
	108	00	01	57		226	00	00	44
	110	00	01	15		199	00	02	11
	107	00	08	96	3. किस्मत राउतपाड़ा	1	00	05	63
	190	00	00	51		13	00	00	28
	105	00	01	37					
	104	00	01	45					
	103	00	05	17					
	92	00	01	53					
	102	00	09	73					
	94	00	03	89					
	95	00	09	07					
	60	00	01	48					
2. चकाघु	165	00	03	51					
	166	00	15	37					
	170	00	11	02					
	171	00	08	09					
	172	00	13	94					
	173	00	03	33					
	175	00	08	08					
	178	00	03	57					
	177	00	06	28					
	176	00	05	05					
	134	00	26	17					
	133	00	02	16					
	132	00	01	46					
	131	00	11	09					
	126	00	00	15					
	127	00	19	66					

[फा. सं. एल-14014/15/2011-जी. पी.]

के. के. शर्मा, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 28th February, 2011

S.O. 728.—Whereas it appears to Government of India that it is necessary in public interest that for transportation of natural gas from onshore terminal at East Coast of Andhra Pradesh of M/s. Reliance Industries Limited to consumers in various parts of the country, Kakinada—Basudebpur—Howrah pipeline should be laid by M/s. Relogistics Infrastructure Limited;

And whereas, it appears to Government of India that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the Right of User in Land under which the said pipeline is proposed to be laid and which are described in the Schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), Government of India hereby declares its intention to acquire the Right of User therein;

Any person interested in the land described in the said Schedule may, within twenty-one days from the date on which the copies of the notification as published in the Gazette of India under sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the said Act, are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of the Right of User therein for laying the pipeline under the land to Shri Bhaskar Tripathy,

Competent Authority, Relogistics Infrastructure Limited,
1st Floor, Fortune Tower, Chandrasekharpur,
Bhubaneswar-751 023, Orissa State.

SCHEDULE

Mandal/Tehsil/Taluk : Bhadrak Rural

District : Bhadrak State : Orissa

Village	Survey No./ Sub- Division	Area to be acquired for ROU Hectare Are C-Are	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1. Daising	1180	00 01 35					
	1181	00 06 00					
	1179	00 17 60					
	1178	00 29 01					
	1176	00 00 47					
	1175	00 04 97					
	1086	00 10 40					
	1068	00 35 24					
	1085	00 12 30					
	1081	00 17 41					
	1078	00 11 99					
	1075	00 00 62					
	1076	00 09 55					
	1074	00 01 14					
	1073	00 00 50					
	1077	00 07 79					
	1025	00 01 75					
	In bet suy No. 1025 & 1026	00 00 64					
	1026	00 05 51					
	1024	00 05 44					
	1021	00 02 88					
	1020	00 00 43					
	1022	00 15 69					
	968	00 18 70					
	1034	00 00 20					
	1035	00 02 57					
	1036	00 09 93					
	944	00 03 91					
	1037	00 02 13					
	943	00 01 17					
	942	00 04 36					
	941	00 02 19					
	940	00 00 10					
	905	00 20 12					
	904	00 00 97					
	901	00 00 10					

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Daising (Contd.)	906	00	05	86
	907	00	05	85
	908	00	02	44
	909	00	09	73
	911	00	00	13
	870	00	04	48
	876	00	00	23
	873	00	01	54
	874	00	02	33
	871	00	02	23
	872	00	05	16
	868	00	00	10
	878	00	04	93
	879	00	06	70
	882	00	01	78
	880	00	14	12
	858	00	02	83
	857	00	06	31
	853	00	10	91
	852	00	04	62
	851	00	03	46
	860	00	00	29
	850	00	05	72
	849	00	10	71
	848	00	18	10
	846	00	12	64
	806	00	11	79
	844	00	00	12
	805	00	00	38
	843	00	06	26
	807	00	18	19
	808	00	04	00
	809	00	17	25
	468	00	00	82
	811	00	00	43
	810	00	03	26
	812	00	00	35
	463	00	10	04
	462	00	12	90
	461	00	07	12
	460	00	13	29
	458	00	01	14
	421	00	13	69
	457	00	01	25
	428	00	14	92
	427	00	01	33

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Daising (Contd.)	426	00	02	27	Alasu (Contd.)	1054	00	03	09
	429	00	21	48		1053	00	14	43
	431	00	00	11		1062	00	01	66
	435	00	10	17		1650	00	19	61
	436	00	05	22		1047	00	00	48
	439	00	00	10		1072	00	01	42
	438	00	08	49		1075	00	02	97
	437	00	01	57		1073	00	00	22
Mandal/Tehsil/Taluk : Soro District : Baleshwar State : Orissa						1076	00	11	66
1. Alasu	761	00	00	35		1078	00	09	16
	760	00	11	33		1085	00	14	56
	646	00	00	53		1087	00	03	77
	647	00	10	82		1088	00	08	07
	648	00	09	40	In bet suy		00	07	08
	649	00	09	36	No. 1088				
	650	00	06	15	& 1089				
	651	00	07	58		1089	00	04	06
	652	00	08	47		1090	00	01	78
	657	00	14	95		1448	00	00	10
	658	00	00	51		1449	00	04	45
	639	00	06	21		1447	00	07	20
	660	00	00	89		1446	00	06	92
	659	00	13	01		1451	00	01	54
	664	00	11	25		1458	00	13	93
	663	00	02	61		1456	00	07	46
	674	00	00			1459	00	06	60
	676	00	05	58		1508	00	08	95
	673	00	03	13		1509	00	26	70
	672	00	12	09		1515	00	00	81
	680	00	00	21		1514	00	03	34
	681	00	00	29		1510	00	13	03
	682	00	11	30		1511	00	06	02
	694	00	18	10		1503	00	11	87
	692	00	09	78		1512	00	12	35
	693	00	01	24		1513	00	05	83
	691	00	00	58		1496	00	00	10
	686	00	02	48		1547	00	16	72
	685	00	00	87		1548	00	14	45
	687	00	05	42		1549	00	21	94
	584	00	22	41		1550	00	02	08
	1049	00	09	25		1551	00	03	76
	1056	00	02	40		1553	00	10	08
	1050	00	03	51		1552	00	01	31
	1051	00	04	77	Mandal/Tehsil/Taluk : Nilagiri District : Baleshwar State : Orissa				
	1052	00	00	82	1. Dwarika	1546	00	00	14
	1055	00	00	10		1547	00	02	60

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Dwariika (Contd.)	1548	00	02	79	Raulakhunta (Contd.)	38	00	03	86
	1545	00	03	35		40	00	20	04
	1544	00	02	39		41	00	19	10
	1552	00	07	38		42	00	07	07
	1557	00	03	48		43	00	01	91
	1553	00	01	63		45	00	07	66
	1556	00	03	89	3. Syamasundarpur	2141	00	10	96
	2011	00	05	72		2142	00	01	49
	1563	00	02	42		2138	00	02	62
	1562	00	06	49		2137	00	01	99
	1567	00	03	84		2135	00	08	32
	1654	00	11	96		3248	00	00	10
	1647	00	02	02		2133	00	00	87
	1648	00	17	97		2132	00	09	25
	1645	00	03	60		2233	00	00	64
	1642	00	04	96		2235	00	11	69
	1636	00	04	00		2234	00	16	09
	1635	00	00	38		3245	00	03	56
	1634	00	09	06		2230	00	01	02
2. Raulakhunta	99	00	00	10		2239	00	01	72
	95	00	20	95		3246	00	05	39
	96	00	00	19		2229	00	09	67
	94	00	00	87		2228	00	06	60
	93	00	14	70		3256	00	06	56
	91	00	01	40		2227	00	15	37
	92	00	04	17		2579	00	00	10
	90	00	02	05		2508	00	02	13
	87	00	04	80		2480	00	00	10
	86	00	05	86		2509	00	11	58
	85	00	15	06		2507	00	09	12
	84	00	00	49		2506	00	03	12
	83	00	08	26		2486	00	00	10
	80	00	05	69		2489	00	00	26
	79	00	10	34		2505	00	07	85
	78	00	10	74		2513	00	00	21
	77	00	02	67		2502	00	03	96
	76	00	17	66		2504	00	00	10
	66	00	01	58		2503	00	03	60
	67	00	16	16		2500	00	03	85
	68	00	00	82		2501	00	05	94
	60	00	03	86		2498	00	07	52
	59	00	11	15		2497	00	11	76
	58	00	00	94		2496	00	00	25
	56	00	11	28		2517	00	14	01
	55	00	22	52		2419	00	03	89
	39	00	07	51		3218	00	03	73

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Syamasundarpur (Contd.)	3217	00	01	25	Kanthiatikar (Contd.)	634	00	12	29
	3266	00	01	58		632	00	00	51
	2414	00	04	99		633	00	15	36
	2413	00	02	40		636	00	02	20
	2412	00	01	86		635	00	02	69
	2518	00	10	11		705	00	05	59
	3064	00	06	85		637	00	00	10
	2525	00	00	46	5. Kanthipada	505	00	05	20
	2519	00	06	89		149	00	03	87
4. Kanthiatikar	447	00	05	07		150	00	10	50
	435	00	01	52		151	00	01	86
	446	00	01	38		167	00	06	94
	436	00	07	03		166	00	04	76
	445	00	01	05		180	00	04	35
	437	00	02	91		165	00	01	92
	438	00	12	19		179	00	01	15
	439	00	00	48		181	00	03	21
	444	00	16	78		182	00	06	12
	532	00	08	89		190	00	01	68
	721	00	02	46		193	00	00	10
	720	00	06	40		191	00	06	88
	387	00	01	38		189	00	08	33
	388	00	00	89		188	00	06	33
	386	00	06	61		202	00	05	07
	723	00	11	18		200	00	00	91
	385	00	07	18		201	00	07	96
	379	00	04	62	6. Dakhinkuanrapur	246	00	00	56
	381	00	00	31		270	00	08	63
	380	00	14	68		247	00	02	00
	377	00	00	10		245	00	03	41
	376	00	17	89		244	00	05	54
	588	00	04	37		243	00	09	85
	375	00	06	64		236	00	06	05
	589	00	03	20		242	00	08	77
	590	00	13	31		141	00	02	27
	597	00	00	10	7. Gobardhanpur	211	00	08	02
	592	00	02	81		210	00	04	14
	596	00	03	74		250	00	03	38
	598	00	02	85		196	00	00	30
	599	00	01	28		209	00	00	36
	595	00	00	10		197	00	13	70
	600	00	12	80		198	00	03	33
	628	00	06	65		206	00	00	10
	601	00	04	42		199	00	05	42
	627	00	05	11		192	00	00	58
	629	00	02	62		191	00	04	98

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Gobardhanpur (Contd.)	172	00	08	01	Tanaka (Contd.)	447	00	09	31
	173	00	01	56		444	00	01	89
	171	00	00	10		512	00	03	61
	174	00	04	15		513	00	08	31
	154	00	01	84		523	00	11	81
	175	00	00	84		525	00	13	00
	142	00	07	03		522	00	07	40
	153	00	06	13		521	00	05	17
	152	00	08	62		527	00	00	70
	156	00	02	59		534	00	09	22
	143	00	03	17		685	00	12	52
	144	00	12	07		535	00	00	10
	145	00	00	55		683	00	03	54
	123	00	08	98		682	00	11	65
	120	00	13	01		681	00	07	75
	118	00	00	09		673	00	00	10
	146	00	03	46		680	00	04	42
8.Tanaka	1071	00	05	84		675	00	00	68
	1073	00	19	00		676	00	02	95
	1072	00	07	18		677	00	02	74
	773	00	00	10		674	00	04	06
	1074	00	00	82	9. Pratapada	76	00	04	31
	770	00	02	96		68	00	10	61
	771	00	01	63		67	00	09	79
	772	00	00	64		66	00	12	50
	474	00	00	52		65	00	03	01
	476	00	03	83		72	00	01	65
	475	00	12	11		52	00	00	76
	485	00	17	27		50	00	30	22
	484	00	00	69		49	00	02	30
	486	00	04	35		48	00	01	20
	488	00	00	65		606	00	10	66
	487	00	04	00	10. Narasinhapur	1838	00	10	55
	490	00	04	99		358	00	02	56
	489	00	03	77		357	00	02	44
	491	00	02	14		356	00	05	11
	493	00	02	88		355	00	11	52
	492	00	02	39		352	00	00	97
	483	00	02	97		353	00	04	50
	496	00	02	86		354	00	21	93
	494	00	04	36		318	00	03	78
	495	00	06	66		319	00	09	57
	498	00	00	28		320	00	02	86
	499	00	00	43		347	00	00	25
	500	00	03	42		321	00	02	95
	501	00	00	41		322	00	00	92

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
11. Nandamohan- patraberh (Contd.)	32	00	03	61	Badaata (Contd.)	553	00	00	48
						494	00	05	85
	31	00	10	78		492	00	12	78
	30	00	07	14		491	00	10	22
	29	00	00	13		490	00	03	81
	36	00	06	01		493	00	01	54
	28	00	18	36		476	00	11	41
	3	00	00	99		477	00	00	39
12. Badaata	686	00	07	92		474	00	02	92
	687	00	09	00		475	00	03	68
	688	00	03	82		471	00	03	62
	708	00	21	80		470	00	05	94
	712	00	01	76		469	00	01	63
	711	00	09	40		299	00	00	24
	709	00	22	77		300	00	06	94
	710	00	00	12		298	00	02	25
	707	00	01	75		301	00	03	17
	695	00	00	10		296	00	06	64
	706	00	08	90		303	00	00	74
	697	00	04	21		304	00	03	11
	696	00	06	78		305	00	01	97
	661	00	09	74		307	00	02	32
	698	00	01	24		306	00	02	86
	658	00	01	16		308	00	04	18
	660	00	03	04		293	00	06	97
	659	00	13	13		238	00	05	39
	653	00	05	42		772	00	06	36
	651	00	05	10		239	00	01	91
	652	00	15	47		230	00	06	48
	648	00	15	62		240	00	05	71
	650	00	00	40		241	00	05	41
	649	00	15	25		123	00	00	68
	598	00	02	43		242	00	07	14
	585	00	05	19		118	00	09	19
	596	00	18	91		116	00	02	22
	589	00	05	25		115	00	04	16
	590	00	07	57		114	00	03	15
	592	00	01	22		113	00	04	57
	591	00	06	68		109	00	05	75
	543	00	21	47		110	00	13	12
	502	00	08	17		111	00	00	13
	544	00	13	25		108	00	00	10
	498	00	11	24		750	00	05	13
	497	00	00	10		58	00	02	02
	496	00	01	40		59	00	24	53
	495	00	06	27		62	00	00	66
						61	00	07	00
						60	00	05	33
						70	00	05	12

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	71	00	10	18	Medinipur (Contd.)	323	00	04	24
	72	00	09	42		326	00	14	20
	73	00	03	62		400	00	04	18
Mandal/Tehsil/Taluk : Khairā District : Baleshwar State : Orissa						398	00	04	32
1. Dularpur	310	00	06	55		330	00	08	65
	312	00	00	55		329	00	03	68
	309	00	04	92		331	00	01	97
	308	00	31	32		332	00	03	01
	319	00	16	51		333	00	05	12
	323	00	04	36		334	00	06	72
	324	00	05	00		360	00	13	39
	325	00	00	10		361	00	09	30
	288	00	02	87		357	00	00	15
	93	00	00	95		355	00	10	57
	102	00	05	03		354	00	10	71
	104	00	03	80		356	00	00	10
	105	00	00	85		353	00	00	22
	101	00	00	65		347	00	15	67
	103	00	05	15		352	00	07	11
	106	00	06	31		350	00	03	97
	111	00	08	37		351	00	00	96
	113	00	04	94		366	00	06	60
	110	00	08	80		387	00	01	46
	114	00	00	74		288	00	02	60
	133	00	08	77		367	00	13	11
	132	00	01	53		368	00	01	06
	135	00	09	06		369	00	08	81
	162	00	04	69		274	00	00	45
	163	00	10	54		273	00	07	01
	164	00	00	39		272	00	09	86
	165	00	13	72		270	00	04	25
	168	00	01	96	3. Anantapur	75	00	09	23
	169	00	02	71		76	00	12	92
	175	00	01	21		74	00	01	51
	174	00	02	07		77	00	06	70
	170	00	00	89		78	00	07	17
	173	00	01	38		80	00	05	87
	172	00	00	67		71	00	07	76
	187	00	02	07		70	00	01	91
	186	00	01	32		47	00	02	52
	185	00	26	24		100	00	00	20
	199	00	00	64		101	00	02	26
	200	00	02	07		69	00	07	66
	201	00	03	18		48	00	07	34
	395	00	02	13		49	00	05	89
2- Medinipur	386	00	01	90		325	00	03	21
	322	00	02	24		53	00	00	12
	401	00	06	19		52	00	01	86
						54	00	02	80

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Anantapur (Contd.)	51	00	04	79	Taranga (Contd.)	58	00	01	28
	In bet suy	00	08	20		79	00	00	21
	No. 51 & 57					62	00	02	10
	57	00	02	53		80	00	00	07
	33	00	00	74		81	00	03	64
	318	00	04	31		61	00	04	47
	23	00	00	90		33	00	02	19
	29	00	04	80		32	00	11	20
	28	00	01	32		34	00	01	04
	27	00	02	51		40	00	07	64
	26	00	00	55	5. Kasindipur	410	00	06	14
	25	00	02	22		411	00	05	55
	319	00	02	56		421	00	02	06
	317	00	01	72		420	00	19	52
	24	00	00	42		414	00	06	25
	16	00	07	18		418	00	00	44
	20	00	14	80		419	00	03	51
	21	00	04	58		423	00	00	10
4. Taranga	223	00	00	58		288	00	25	47
	221	00	01	36		279	00	11	82
	222	00	01	98		271	00	00	22
	229	00	02	30		273	00	05	65
	220	00	07	28		202	00	00	35
	219	00	00	40		267	00	01	66
	217	00	03	02		270	00	02	32
	216	00	29	27					
	215	00	03	30	Mandal/Tehsil/1	Similia District : Baleshwar State : Orissa			
	156	00	08	22	1. Hatuari	439	00	06	35
	157	00	03	65		907	00	12	69
	148	00	00	23		8	00	00	50
	147	00	04	22		9	00	02	77
	158	00	26	61		44	00	03	19
	139	00	03	33		45	00	01	39
	138	00	07	32		46	00	00	32
	137	00	01	70		42	00	02	11
	136	00	14	67		43	00	01	69
	1719	00	00	63		10	00	00	99
	119	00	10	51		11	00	00	10
	117	00	10	98		894	00	01	48
	118	00	04	20		14	00	03	38
	1722	00	01	06		47	00	00	22
	124	00	02	32		41	00	07	74
	72	00	00	28		40	00	09	20
	71	00	14	67		16	00	01	78
	66	00	11	79		39	00	06	06
	65	00	00	02		37	00	00	56
	64	00	01	07		38	00	03	92
	75	00	02	45		57	00	00	49
	63	00	05	73		56	00	00	10

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Hatnari	58	00	04	12	Kundi	1123	00	03	27
	35	00	00	74	3. Sebang	178	00	00	12
	62	00	01	84		163	00	12	69
	61	00	03	10		1544	00	03	50
	63	00	00	18		164	00	02	20
	60	00	00	82		165	00	12	78
	64	00	12	61		168	00	01	29
	76	00	02	48		166	00	12	46
	75	00	00	21		167	00	00	78
	885	00	01	16		154	00	04	02
	74	00	04	58		153	00	09	97
	70	00	01	31		149	00	06	81
	71	00	02	66		151	00	01	38
	73	00	03	46		150	00	02	76
	72	00	00	36		147	00	16	88
	2	00	03	87		146	00	00	10
	1	00	04	08		145	00	05	73
2. Kundi	1166	00	01	57		143	00	01	19
	1165	00	05	40		306	00	13	07
	1160	00	01	98		307	00	02	15
	1161	00	01	01		308	00	13	13
	1162	00	01	17		309	00	01	33
	1163	00	00	18		318	00	06	31
	1154	00	00	97		320	00	00	40
	1156	00	00	69		317	00	00	16
	1155	00	01	17		319	00	05	74
	1150	00	00	27		326	00	00	10
	1144	00	01	45		327	00	02	98
	1145	00	01	54		328	00	04	66
	1149	00	00	10		329	00	03	22
	1146	00	01	14		332	00	07	62
	1148	00	00	08		330	00	00	45
	1143	00	02	84		331	00	21	65
	1147	00	03	37		363	00	01	19
	1135	00	00	44		327	00	00	34
	1142	00	00	10		495	00	14	85
	1133	00	04	20		494	00	02	31
	1137	00	01	41			00	09	01
	1140	00	02	38		493	00	02	06
	1139	00	01	88		492	00	00	19
	1136	00	00	48		526	00	01	97
	1127	00	03	54		497	00	09	54
	1128	00	04	35		491	00	01	97
	1129	00	01	79		498	00	06	25
	1130	00	00	77		499	00	04	99
	1126	00	01	48		487	00	01	14
	1125	00	00	51		500	00	00	60
	1124	00	11	29		486	00	10	22
	1122	00	00	10		485	00	01	90

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Sabang	484	00	04	02	Mahammadpur	1103	00	01	89
	473	00	00	51	(Contd.)	1102	00	05	18
	483	00	03	15		1104	00	00	27
	482	00	01	37		1107	00	02	06
	479	00	00	10		1108	00	03	95
	474	00	04	01		1127	00	00	11
	476	00	04	03		1109	00	00	81
	475	00	04	02		1112	00	16	86
	477	00	04	27		1125	00	01	52
	469	00	01	20		1124	00	00	16
	468	00	03	69		1113	00	01	02
	478	00	00	39		1117	00	00	10
	2489	00	03	69		1121	00	07	98
	465	00	03	42		1120	00	02	61
	467	00	00	10		1119	00	02	51
	466	00	03	57		1122	00	09	33
	2487	00	00	20		1137	00	00	34
	464	00	02	49		1118	00	02	36
	806	00	02	11		1044	00	00	57
	808	00	13	89		1042	00	06	05
	809	00	00	29		1041	00	05	14
	810	00	07	61		1040	00	00	32
	2542	00	00	10		1043	00	00	35
	811	00	01	59		1037	00	05	09
	819	00	07	87		1039	00	04	16
	2522	00	00	47		1027	00	00	52
	812	00	00	62		1038	00	02	00
	818	00	06	44		1029	00	02	51
	824	00	00	25		1028	00	00	10
	817	00	13	61		1031	00	00	14
	816	00	02	24		1030	00	03	90
	835	00	04	11		1024	00	04	31
	833	00	00	78		1023	00	03	41
	834	00	03	85		1022	00	01	16
	836	00	02	51		1170	00	07	25
	839	00	00	24		1171	00	08	60
	837	00	02	19		1172	00	05	74
	838	00	03	02		996	00	02	95
	840	00	00	96		995	00	02	41
4. Mahammadpur	1086	00	00	16		994	00	03	33
	1092	00	07	49		993	00	03	72
	1093	00	07	20		988	00	00	44
	1091	00	00	17		992	00	01	81
	1094	00	02	40		939	00	04	69
	1097	00	00	10		990	00	03	42
	1095	00	04	84		986	00	05	51
	1096	00	02	02		991	00	00	46
	1101	00	00	67		981	00	00	10
	1089	00	01	68		983	00	02	27

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Mahammadpur	985	00	00	45	5. Anandapur	77	00	08	88
	982	00	00	84		78	00	01	02
	984	00	09	13		85	00	13	75
	914	00	08	30		532	00	00	10
	1640	00	07	03		531	00	02	64
	913	00	06	36		84	00	00	48
	915	00	00	24		530	00	08	19
	1639	00	06	12		86	00	04	32
	912	00	06	29		87	00	01	03
	1638	00	06	35		90	00	00	10
	910	00	00	74		529	00	08	65
	909	00	04	30		523	00	00	32
	819	00	00	93		528	00	04	51
	908	00	10	52		91	00	00	10
	820	00	00	71		527	00	02	47
	907	00	07	06		526	00	11	24
	1633	00	04	20		206	00	08	33
	821	00	02	29		209	00	01	16
	899	00	07	01		208	00	05	92
	822	00	01	47		210	00	06	76
	898	00	11	05		207	00	00	12
	895	00	00	52		391	00	00	15
	897	00	00	25		211	00	05	72
	896	00	14	56		390	00	03	11
	894	00	00	52		212	00	02	58
	890	00	01	40		213	00	00	82
	1651	00	03	69		389	00	09	05
	856	00	00	35		388	00	00	06
	857	00	10	27		387	00	03	75
	889	00	09	48		385	00	03	64
	887	00	08	06		384	00	00	18
	885	00	06	33		386	00	07	15
	884	00	03	23		414	00	02	72
	881	00	10	39		415	00	06	33
	878	00	10	51		417	00	00	10
	877	00	11	78		416	00	04	29
	1331	00	00	88		418	00	01	10
	1334	00	00	68		419	00	01	14
	873	00	05	19		420	00	00	79
	1336	00	01	35		431	00	00	67
	1335	00	02	90		430	00	01	80
	1340	00	00	10		421	00	02	16
	872	00	01	27		471	00	02	13
	1337	00	00	54		422	00	02	53
	867	00	03	86		429	00	05	25
	1338	00	12	77		428	00	00	10
	866	00	01	56		423	DO	01	02
	1339	00	01	32		426	00	00	10
						470	00	02	34

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Apandapur	472	00	01	01	Baunsamukha	491	00	00	73
(Contd.)	468	00	02	22	(Contd.)	487	00	00	43
	425	00	01	07		492	00	11	52
	467	00	01	04		493	00	13	98
	466	00	05	48		494	00	00	80
	440	00	00	10		497	00	03	76
	461	00	11	44		498	00	03	60
	462	00	00	62		499	00	03	62
	460	00	01	51		506	00	01	67
	459	00	18	89		507	00	05	65
	2213	00	51	48		505	00	00	37
	2111	00	26	58		508	00	02	26
	351	00	03	54		509	00	00	10
Mandal/Tehsil/Taluk : Basta District : Baleshwar State : Orissa						504	00	15	18
1. Deulpara	In bet VB & Suy No. 45	00	05	91	3. Nilambarpur	9	00	09	69
	45	00	00	90		8	00	01	76
	72	00	36	75		7	00	03	98
	98	00	15	42		6	00	09	78
	99	00	24	75		11	00	01	52
	302	00	02	85		5	00	00	13
	100	00	05	12		12	00	09	21
	123	00	00	24		29	00	03	40
	125	00	02	34		14	00	04	28
	124	00	05	72		13	00	07	24
2. Baunsamukha	319	00	04	47		15	00	10	89
	315	00	04	36		17	00	03	19
	318	00	01	10		16	00	02	91
	316	00	01	72		18	00	00	38
	317	00	08	80	4. Barmadia	104/702	00	08	66
	314	00	11	04		103/701	00	09	43
	324	00	01	27		105/703	00	04	31
	325	00	00	71		106/704	00	01	44
	398	00	04	72		700	00	01	87
	399	00	07	77		102/699	00	07	86
	397	00	00	86		101/698	00	02	46
	400	00	01	94		100/697	00	08	60
	402	00	02	11		97/694	00	00	28
	393	00	05	81		99/696	00	09	09
	404	00	03	74		66/662	00	00	10
	405	00	01	70		98/695	00	03	49
	403	00	02	87		94/691	00	00	32
	406	00	01	64		69/65	00	02	23
	389	00	00	10		70/66	00	04	58
	407	00	09	71		71/67	00	08	96
	411	00	00	13		91/687	00	00	30
	410	00	02	09		8/842	00	00	38
	408	00	03	13		73/69	00	02	88
	409	00	06	73		76/672	00	06	89
	490	00	00	10		90/686	00	01	59

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Barnadia	75/671	00	00	12	Kismat	110	00	01	15
	60/656	00	02	00	Gobardhanpur	107	00	08	96
	77/673	00	10	66		190	00	00	51
	81/677	00	00	48		105	00	01	37
	78/674	00	02	13		104	00	01	45
	80/676	00	05	54		103	00	05	17
	184/857	00	04	19		92	00	01	53
	79/675	00	00	96		102	00	09	73
5. Gobardhan Pur	1	00	23	38		94	00	03	89
	4	00	00	14		95	00	09	07
6. Madhubhanda	12	00	03	68		60	00	01	48
	1	00	18	21	2. Chakraghu	165	00	03	51
	5	00	03	62		166	00	15	37
	4	00	00	24		170	00	11	02
	2	00	11	79		171	00	08	09
	3	00	13	66		172	00	13	94
	22	00	04	03		173	00	03	33
	23	00	01	08		175	00	08	08
Mandal/Tehsil/Taluk : Jaleswar District : Baleswar State : Orissa						178	00	03	57
1. Kismat	136	00	02	81		177	00	06	28
Gobardhanpur						176	00	05	05
	143	00	09	40		134	00	26	17
	142	00	01	34		133	00	02	16
	141	00	01	64		132	00	01	46
	144	00	00	53		131	00	11	09
	146	00	01	59		126	00	00	15
	147	00	08	49		127	00	19	66
	149	00	01	02		128	00	00	72
	148	00	06	45		119	00	02	82
	158	00	00	33		120	00	03	95
	151	00	00	56		121	00	01	98
	157	00	06	11		118	00	08	29
	161	00	00	10		122	00	00	29
	156	00	12	43		117	00	15	08
	207	00	00	10		192	00	02	49
	206	00	02	96		193	00	02	71
	155	00	01	34		219	00	15	34
	272	00	01	44		220	00	04	52
	171	00	01	49		218	00	01	13
	173	00	06	96		221	00	08	29
	176	00	04	43		225	00	00	10
	174	00	00	36		223	00	06	01
	175	00	08	94		224	00	23	57
	187	00	02	30		205	00	00	45
	198	00	01	41		204	00	03	86
	112	00	00	59		226	00	00	44
	111	00	01	53		199	00	02	11
	109	00	04	84	3. Kismat Routpara	1	00	05	63
	108	00	01	57		13	00	00	28

नई दिल्ली, 28 फरवरी, 2011

का.आ. 729.—भारत सरकार को लोकहित में यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स रिलाएन्स इंडस्ट्रीज लिमिटेड के आन्ध्र प्रदेश में पूर्वी तट पर ऑनशोर टर्मिनल से देश के विभिन्न हिस्सों में उपभोक्ताओं तक प्रकृतिक गैस के परिवहन के लिए, मैसर्स रिलोजिस्टिक्स इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर लिमिटेड द्वारा काकीनाडा-बासुदेबपुर-हावड़ा पाइपलाइन बिछाई जानी चाहिए;

और भारत सरकार को उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि उस भूमि में, जिसके भीतर उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने का प्रस्ताव है और जो इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित है, उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाए;

अतः, अब, भारत सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उनमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है;

कोई व्यक्ति, जो उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध है, उस तारीख से जिसको उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन जारी की गई अधिसूचना की प्रतियाँ साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध कर दी जाती हैं, इक्कीस दिन के भीतर, भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने के लिए उपायोग के अधिकार के अर्जन के संबंध में श्री वारिद वरन गुहा, सक्षम प्राधिकारी, मैसर्स रिलोजिस्टिक्स इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर लिमिटेड, 7, वूड स्ट्रीट तिसरी मंजिल कोलकाता-700016, पश्चिम बंगाल राज्य को लिखित रूप में आक्षेप भेज सकेगा।

अनुसूची

मंडल/तहसील/ : तालुक : इग्रा-1 जिला : मेदिनीपुर
राज्य : पश्चिम बंगाल

गांव का नाम सर्वे सं/सब आर.ओ.यू. अर्जित करने के लिए क्षेत्रफल हेक्टेयर एयर सि एयर डिविजन सं.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
(1) कसबगोला	1337	00	00	98
	3306	00	06	61
	1338	00	03	23
	1336	00	01	30
	1335	00	00	10
	1334	00	11	77
	1320	00	00	34
	1321	00	08	73
	1327	00	03	80
	1322	00	04	94
	1316	00	00	10

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
कसबगोला (निरंतर)	1307	00	09	09
	1308	00	01	15
	1312	00	01	40
	1314	00	00	64
	1313	00	06	08
	1311	00	03	50
	1124	00	00	10
	1123	00	00	10
	1121	00	04	21
	1120	00	05	88
	1119	00	00	12
	1118	00	23	43
	1116	00	00	10
	1117	00	05	81
	1097	00	00	10
	1098	00	06	37
	1099	00	04	61
	1100	00	00	16
	1094	00	06	52
	1093	00	00	27
	3245	00	07	36
	1091	00	06	35
	3247	00	00	10
	3283	00	01	63
	3246	00	04	99
	3284	00	00	10
	1088	00	11	01
	1086	00	00	97
	1050	00	05	49
	1084	00	02	75
	1051	00	07	56
	3270	00	08	01
	3273	00	00	27
	3272	00	02	55
	3271	00	05	91
	1061	00	02	58
	1052	00	01	09
	3061	00	14	93
	1056	00	03	01
	1060	00	07	80
	1058	00	06	08

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
कसबगोला (जारी)	28	00	00	87	(2) पंचरोल	3622	00	03	44
	1059	00	13	35		3623	00	09	12
	3277	00	04	29		3783	00	07	93
	1036	00	00	78		3624	00	08	19
	1035	00	09	10		3625	00	08	37
	1034	00	08	30		3626	00	11	40
	3264	00	05	47		3837	00	01	68
	29	00	04	17		2244	00	06	78
	137	00	13	99		1436	00	13	37
	138	00	16	20		2437	00	03	44
	140	00	00	10		2439	00	00	59
	139	00	08	17		2438	00	10	24
	135	00	05	07		3830	00	04	41
	134	00	09	85		2440	00	01	96
	133	00	07	01		2441	00	16	42
	3136	00	01	31		2442	00	15	26
	131	00	12	79		2453	00	07	83
	130	00	03	33		2456	00	00	21
	127	00	02	71		2455	00	01	12
	3153	00	05	23		2454	00	02	57
	129	00	01	07		2452	00	02	23
	128	00	09	55		2760	00	13	98
	167	00	01	63		2755	00	02	56
	125	00	00	21		2761	00	05	91
	166	00	09	05		2669	00	15	88
	119	00	10	58		3847	00	07	64
	120	00	00	47		2768	00	03	66
	118	00	06	81		2770	00	01	57
	117	00	07	70		3848	00	00	30
	108	00	00	40		2771	00	08	78
	3147	00	01	61		2772	00	17	08
	111	00	01	98		2748	00	00	10
	3148	00	00	10		2773	00	08	46
	3145	00	02	14		2774	00	00	10
	110	00	03	63		2892	00	01	22
	3146	00	01	76		3849	00	02	19
	109	00	07	48		2777	00	00	15
	112	00	02	04		2811	00	03	81
	103	00	01	64		2779	00	06	51
	3172	00	00	10		2810	00	00	10
						2781	00	00	14

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
पंचरोल (निरंतर)	2783	00	02	62	पंचरोल (निरंतर)	3902	00	06	99
	2780	00	14	12		3475	00	13	41
	2782	00	01	70		3484	00	00	1-
	3850	00	01	99		3876	00	07	12
	2808	00	01	40		3476	00	02	10
	2809	00	03	67		3872	00	08	39
	2807	00	01	11		3482	00	00	10
	2806	00	15	16		3480	00	20	25
	2841	00	02	01		3873	00	00	35
	3566	00	01	15		3419	00	18	61
	2846	00	15	53		3417	00	08	87
	2844	00	00	81		3414	00	01	78
	2843	00	01	84		3415	00	11	00
	2845	00	00	75		3394	00	09	02
	2847	00	00	10		3393	00	03	76
	3111	00	01	18	(3) रेखा	23	00	08	7
	3109	00	11	15		22	00	01	6-
	3110	00	00	64		20	00	06	64
	3862	00	00	10		21	00	05	42
	3861	00	01	32		19	00	01	85
	3115	00	01	38		18	00	11	01
	3108	00	15	81		8	00	07	14
	3103	00	01	18		6	00	00	49
	3107	00	07	38		5	00	04	71
	3154	00	14	79		4	00	11	97
	3156	00	02	42		3	00	07	29
	3155	00	12	50		सर्वे सं. 3 और	00	01	44
	3507	00	00	10		गाँव सीमा के			
	3158	00	14	89		बीच में नाला			
	3506	00	00	43	(4) बिलबर	गाँव सीमा और	00	01	70
	3504	00	10	75		सर्वे सं. के 389			
	3899	00	09	27		के बीच में			
	3505	00	02	38		389	00	36	51
	3502	00	10	42		397	00	16	39
	3879	00	05	69		396	00	04	65
	3501	00	00	25		395	00	09	18
	3500	00	11	90		399	00	02	19
	3870	00	00	81		400	00	08	15
	3497	00	16	56		489	00	08	18
	3473	00	00	34		590	00	00	18
	3496	00	02	03		488	00	04	62

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
बिलबर (जारी)	487	00	02	96	अलगिरी (निरंतर)	1629	00	19	75
	468	00	01	48		1588	00	17	25
	486	00	16	91		1606	00	00	22
	588	00	00	22		1605	00	14	31
	485	00	11	16		4514	00	00	10
	483	00	11	35		1604	00	07	36
	484	00	02	04		1602	00	00	65
	842	00	03	59		1603	00	11	91
	586	00	03	96		4516	00	21	21
	587	00	01	79		4520	00	07	85
	480	00	19	17		1597	00	00	11
	456	00	00	15		1598	00	05	37
(5) बाया	7	00	00	43		1594	00	11	47
	6	00	18	72		1595	00	00	67
	5	00	03	11		1596	00	08	36
	सर्वे सं. 5 और	00	06	44		1946	00	01	47
	83 के बीच में					1942	00	09	49
	83	00	00	10		1940	00	03	53
	37	00	10	82		1941	00	09	30
	226	00	14	61		1936	00	01	75
(6) अलगिरी	1531	00	04	59		1943	00	02	93
	1657	00	00	10		1938	00	05	33
	1655	00	06	05		1937	00	27	67
	1534	00	01	72		4593	00	11	21
	1656	00	05	47		4106	00	01	76
	1642	00	10	63		4110	00	10	85
	1641	00	10	52		4111	00	00	10
	1640	00	00	43		3376	00	12	71
	1645	00	04	21		3375	00	02	91
	1646	00	00	50		3374	00	00	10
	1647	00	12	84		4113	00	19	74
	1648	00	01	40		4118	00	00	86
	1649	00	05	38		3363	00	13	75
	1635	00	15	72		3362	00	15	31
	1564	00	03	74		3357	00	02	16
	637	00	13	78		3361	00	04	90
	1632	00	04	74		3358	00	09	28
	1630	00	13	54		3356	00	05	64
	4269	00	16	02		4712	00	12	39
	1628	00	01	70		3272	00	03	31

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
अलगिरी (निरंतर)	3273	00	09	98	अलगिरी (निरंतर)	3083	00	00	41
	3274	00	01	79		3082	00	11	41
	3237	00	06	16		3081	00	11	52
	3236	00	05	92	(7) जैरतन	42	00	00	10
	3235	00	22	36		40	00	08	29
	3230	00	00	35		41	00	07	35
	4684	00	16	13		39	00	10	98
	3231	00	09	16		3	00	12	30
	3226	00	02	09		4049	00	07	96
	3225	00	07	88		4	00	01	26
	3223	00	02	55		5	00	12	30
	3224	00	14	32		6	00	14	39
	3218	00	09	89		9	00	01	05
	3217	00	03	55		13	00	13	36
	3186	00	00	26		12	00	07	74
	3185	00	19	98		14	00	08	58
	3187	00	08	98		11	00	00	40
	3188	00	08	23		15	00	12	50
	3180	00	09	13		16	00	01	67
	3179	00	00	83		17	00	14	19
	3177	00	05	41		18	00	04	73
	3152	00	03	55	(8) कटबनी	460	00	00	10
	3153	00	01	27		461	00	14	64
	3141	00	04	58		475	00	04	34
	3154	00	07	43		462	00	02	55
	3155	00	10	26		474	00	13	05
	3156	00	08	97		473	00	01	53
	3118	00	19	97		472	00	09	89
	3117	00	10	17		471	00	05	04
	3115	00	00	10		480	00	13	47
	3116	00	05	55		469	00	08	62
	4658	00	00	57		484	00	16	98
	3107	00	06	65		485	00	00	45
	3108	00	03	51		410	00	03	33
	4657	00	07	20		409	00	05	73
	4656	00	06	13		408	00	03	28
	3094	00	15	83		346	00	01	82
	3090	00	01	11		345	00	08	25
	3086	00	08	77		344	00	11	78
	4646	00	07	66		342	00	00	18
	3087	00	00	35		343	00	02	81

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
कटवनी (निरंतर)	576	00	00	78	उलुआ (निरंतर)	333	00	00	19
	327	00	16	20		41	00	05	54
	326	00	04	12		214	00	00	14
	328	00	00	50		44	00	12	83
	325	00	07	80		213	00	00	18
	322	00	01	17		45	00	07	76
	323	00	12	73		46	00	18	49
	324	00	00	66		47	00	00	10
	315	00	07	13		161	00	05	40
	306	00	01	53		159	00	00	64
	314	00	00	15		52	00	08	69
	308	00	06	80		51	00	00	55
	307	00	02	34		158	00	01	64
	309	00	02	53		53	00	06	84
	258	00	06	88		339	00	02	29
	574	00	01	34		353	00	01	14
	260	00	03	34		54	00	11	67
	261	00	01	71		155	00	03	33
	262	00	00	19		56	00	15	62
	263	00	01	29		110	00	13	22
	256	00	01	21		323	00	00	20
	255	00	05	28		109	00	00	27
	264	00	00	29		108	00	03	46
	254	00	03	17		107	00	12	15
	253	00	01	63		104	00	01	32
	252	00	00	39		100	00	08	26
	251	00	01	37		101	00	01	19
	249	00	08	86		102	00	08	28
	250	00	02	25		98	00	00	59
	230	00	00	17		97	00	01	70
	248	00	16	75		96	00	01	06
	232	00	02	14		95	00	02	06
	233	00	02	58		94	00	02	00
	235	00	09	26		92	00	01	40
	234	00	01	17		88	00	28	62
	236	00	08	80		82	00	00	24
	189	00	00	35		81	00	11	34
(9) उलुआ	215	00	00	96		80	00	03	28
	336	00	15	15	(10) बेनचकरी	851	00	30	44
	338	00	00	84		852	00	03	87
	40	00	09	01		1097	00	01	43

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
नचकरी (जारी)	858	00	08	80	नराहरिपुर (जारी)	124	00	00	36
	1096	00	11	16		27	00	00	27
	857	00	02	91		23	00	01	44
	861	00	03	49		20	00	04	54
	862	00	07	95		24	00	00	70
	863	00	08	60		25	00	03	75
	866	00	03	53		19	00	00	64
	864	00	01	87		18	00	11	95
	865	00	03	79		17	00	00	90
	867	00	03	03		15	00	01	04
	974	00	01	19		13	00	02	15
	973	00	05	12		40	00	18	32
	972	00	05	72		41	00	01	91
	1087	00	07	24		42	00	07	28
	976	00	03	28		45	00	04	39
	1088	00	07	71		43	00	00	18
	1089	00	01	65		44	00	03	53
	967	00	23	85		371	00	02	55
	966	00	23	72		47	00	15	74
	1080	00	03	18		46	00	00	47
	907	00	02	38		52	00	10	40
	909	00	00	14		53	00	10	16
	933	00	01	78		54	00	00	94
	929	00	02	85		373	00	02	08
	928	00	14	17		55	00	09	78
	927	00	11	37		57	00	00	51
	64	00	03	86		366	00	00	79
(11) सातखंड	1	00	00	53		365	00	09	78
(12) नराहरिपुर	144	00	00	17		56	00	04	65
	137	00	16	75		360	00	02	51
	136	00	03	85		361	00	02	45
	135	00	02	21		58	00	07	43
	138	00	00	86		362	00	00	89
	134	00	03	62		363	00	07	31
	133	00	02	79		364	00	03	60
	132	00	03	67		59	00	00	16
	131	00	04	98		62	00	04	35
	127	00	07	82		49	00	00	10
	128	00	02	31	(13) कुदी	300	00	01	44
	126	00	05	03		289	00	12	72
	125	00	03	22		288	00	23	70

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
कुदी (जारी)	287	00	00	25	(14) होसेनपुर	35	00	13	18
	284	00	00	48		36	00	15	61
	285	00	14	42		37	00	12	56
	2320	00	00	10		33	00	02	02
	262	00	24	96		43	00	07	23
	1611	00	04	56		32	00	13	72
	263	00	08	18		30	00	09	72
	265	00	01	92		29	00	07	33
	264	00	03	13		26	00	08	54
	290	00	02	11		सर्वे सं. 26 और	00	17	20
	258	00	05	69		21 के बीच में			
	259	00	05	69		21	00	15	06
	1305	00	01	62		18	00	02	13
	239	00	00	10		20	00	09	23
	240	00	18	42	(15) रामक्रिष्णपुर	182	00	02	59
	241	00	08	65		4	00	07	46
	238	00	00	87		3	00	04	39
	242	00	10	41		416	00	08	50
	236	00	36	11		6	00	16	57
	212	00	06	74		10	00	03	53
	224	00	01	09		425	00	14	39
	213	00	00	29		9	00	00	11
	222	00	15	82		424	00	01	02
	215	00	14	07		11	00	16	44
	216	00	22	18		12	00	00	57
	217	00	01	36	(16) बस्तिया	672	00	10	17
	218	00	00	56		673	00	16	73
	199	00	25	65		675	00	01	25
	201	00	00	22		674	00	11	37
	198	00	22	04		650	00	01	43
	197	00	06	80		649	00	05	66
	157	00	13	53		648	00	09	25
	189	00	11	13		646	00	21	40
	188	00	06	05		647	00	03	09
	160	00	07	37		645	00	00	80
	187	00	00	92	(17) दलुलुआ	278	00	14	19
	165	00	11	91		276	00	10	34
	166	00	11	04		280	00	02	31
	1296	00	05	65		281	00	09	21
	167	00	08	26		960	00	11	22
	171	00	00	98		282	00	01	09
	170	00	12	56					

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
बलुआ (जारी)	962	00	00	54	(19) पूर्वाधिक अलुआ	130	00	06	17
	961	00	12	81		176	00	00	10
	285	00	12	78		256	00	00	40
	1056	00	00	43		131	00	26	99
(18) उल्लिखित	421	00	01	19		174	00	00	42
	419	00	00	66		132	00	15	65
	422	00	00	33		134	00	00	79
	562	00	11	46		129	00	03	72
	420	00	03	59		135	00	13	77
	556	00	09	41		128	00	02	65
	563	00	01	69		125	00	11	95
	558	00	00	24		194	00	00	39
	555	00	01	18		124	00	06	47
	557	00	21	30		126	00	06	06
	415	00	02	41		112	00	22	20
	533	00	08	21		113	00	00	60
	538	00	00	12		107	00	09	42
	354	00	01	38		111	00	04	96
	355	00	15	34		109	00	00	90
	536	00	01	18		231	00	10	43
	535	00	06	68		108	00	05	48
	357	00	01	24		230	00	05	32
	358	00	05	47		229	00	11	76
	534	00	00	10		91	00	00	74
	359	00	25	32		79	00	03	47
	368	00	01	54		78	00	00	15
	369	00	07	05		80	00	13	67
	367	00	00	10		66	00	27	89
	546	00	13	24		67	00	13	85
	372	00	08	14		64	00	01	90
	244	00	00	32		57	00	01	62
	243	00	03	48		58	00	06	21
	505	00	06	40		56	00	00	10
	373	00	00	21		59	00	07	39
	504	00	01	11		33	00	00	10
	548	00	04	73		60	00	02	62
	591	00	04	25		32	00	07	91
	590	00	00	10		217	00	08	27
	252	00	10	07		31	00	04	07
						30	00	01	22

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
पूर्वाचक अलुआ (जारी)	सर्वे सं. 30 और 214 के बीच में	00	05	59	(2) असुरा	41	00	15	45
						40	00	00	11
	214	00	00	08		177	00	12	56
	28	00	00	10		39	00	00	10
(20) कस्बा इग्रा	गौव सीमा और सर्वे सं. 3844 के बीच में	00	00	10		176	00	09	46
						54	00	04	33
						38	00	04	33
	3844	00	00	46		175	00	10	63
	3845	00	13	73		35	00	00	91
	3864	00	06	45		46	00	15	72
	3846	00	04	70		33	00	02	65
	3863	00	03	00		32	00	04	97
	3862	00	05	57		31	00	01	48
	3860	00	14	66		171	00	00	36
	3859	00	00	15		29	00	12	80
मंडल/तहसील/तालुक : मोहनपुर						30	00	07	12
जिला : मेदिनीपुर						73	00	00	20
राज्य : पश्चिम बंगाल						74	00	07	75
(1) निलपुर	71	00	00	95	(3) अगररा	1016	00	00	24
	72	00	05	67		1017	00	01	61
	75	00	08	56		927	00	06	75
	77	00	06	45		928	00	14	58
	74	00	01	39		931	00	12	59
	78	00	16	46		929	00	00	48
	63	00	00	53		930	00	21	75
	62	00	13	59	(4) संदापुर	35	00	29	56
	60	00	16	55		37	00	03	81
	56	00	02	98		180	00	02	25
	1743	00	15	67		38	00	02	66
	1835	00	02	06		39	00	00	71
	1742	00	01	61		179	00	05	88
	1741	00	00	20		769	00	09	23
	48	00	38	56		172	00	00	85
	47	00	01	17		174	00	00	22
	42	00	08	30		173	00	09	99
	41	00	03	00		168	00	00	10
	39	00	03	87		171	00	00	38
	37	00	16	38		170	00	04	85
	36	00	01	70		169	00	01	42
	35	00	08	10		175	00	00	10
	33	00	12	59		162	00	14	95
	32	00	01	91		163	00	00	45
	209	00	14	89					

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
संक्षेप (जारी)	161	00	02	25	तारणिया (जारी)	698	00	00	10
	391	00	06	17		852	00	27	37
	151	00	13	53		843	00	07	54
	152	00	02	15		847	00	14	07
	153	00	00	10		848	00	00	08
	389	00	09	81		877	00	49	04
	147	00	04	59		965	00	00	24
	142	00	01	87	(6) पालुया	847	00	08	24
	388	00	03	20		846	00	06	32
	145	00	00	99		848	00	00	18
	387	00	02	54		854	00	11	60
	146	00	02	19		856	00	09	96
	140	00	00	95		852	00	00	52
	144	00	02	43		653	00	18	71
	134	00	00	80		859	00	20	59
	135	00	05	11		954	00	11	41
	136	00	00	10		861	00	05	26
	139	00	05	75		860	00	19	21
	137	00	01	65		869	00	02	03
	138	00	01	93		870	00	16	91
	129	00	03	41		872	00	00	21
	386	00	04	48		871	00	18	98
	385	00	00	11		287	00	02	65
	128	00	26	68		288	00	00	54
	119	00	03	36		277	00	00	82
	122	00	00	98		286	00	13	77
	121	00	07	58		284	00	02	15
	120	00	00	20		290	00	06	31
	109	00	22	00		674	00	00	10
(5) तारणिया	692	00	00	34		291	00	22	66
	949	00	09	39		667	00	04	35
	688	00	00	26		672	00	00	30
	689	00	02	01		668	00	19	88
	950	00	01	14		665	00	10	33
	948	00	18	49		664	00	09	05
	687	00	00	10		663	00	04	04
	690	00	01	91		662	00	00	33
	696	00	15	53		317	00	15	03
	697	00	00	51		922	00	01	57
	951	00	15	10		647	00	14	29

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
पालुया (जारी)	645	00	15	39	काशिचक (जारी)	65	00	01	38
	646	00	02	12		73	00	02	45
	644	00	01	72		71	00	04	55
	558	00	11	65		74	00	08	70
	559	00	00	46		389	00	01	64
	560	00	01	76		388	00	01	82
	557	00	04	64		75	00	03	77
	556	00	04	49		77	00	01	04
	551	00	06	85		78	00	00	10
	552	00	09	68		76	00	08	34
	550	00	01	38		79	00	00	90
	513	00	02	52		385	00	00	11
(7) तनुया	3077	00	00	47	(9) मितिनिया	424	00	12	64
	3078	00	00	81		686	00	00	57
	3079	00	04	51		685	00	00	75
	3080	00	05	20		687	00	04	06
	3081	00	14	11		688	00	05	51
	3022	00	01	47		690	00	02	02
	3021	00	03	68		689	00	04	65
	3083	00	00	11		684	00	03	97
	3084	00	08	85		683	00	00	21
	3085	00	02	85		700	00	03	72
	3086	00	00	31		699	00	01	99
	3087	00	03	86		701	00	09	65
(8) काशिचक	204	00	01	66		714	00	06	62
	195	00	03	48		711	00	02	80
	181	00	04	63		712	00	04	85
	190	00	00	68		713	00	02	41
	188	00	06	71		704	00	01	80
	187	00	03	32		707	00	00	95
	56	00	05	18		708	00	05	91
	48	00	06	22		710	00	00	58
	51	00	01	03		709	00	02	84
	50	00	14	57		725	00	00	74
	49	00	00	51		726	00	05	86
	57	00	02	88		721	00	05	65
	58	00	04	19		352	00	01	29
	387	00	05	53		728	00	02	45
	59	00	00	70		730	00	09	47
	64	00	06	10		300	00	14	85
	72	00	07	89		640	00	01	13

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
मितिनिया (जारी)	623	00	07	60	(11) गर्ग	468	00	01	88
	624	00	10	54		519	00	00	10
	626	00	01	31		470	00	06	39
	625	00	06	24		471	00	10	68
	622	00	00	10		472	00	13	01
	618	00	20	99		477	00	00	57
	616	00	10	96		540	00	10	56
	784	00	01	13		581	00	09	18
	599	00	05	28		473	00	13	82
	592	00	11	23		474	00	07	85
	606	00	04	73		511	00	05	42
	590	00	10	69		510	00	03	17
	589	00	07	12		512	00	17	11
	588	00	05	47	(12) तिलडापडा	676	00	12	26
	587	00	03	06		675	00	11	64
	586	00	02	64		1015	00	02	65
(10) मयूरखोला	100	00	07	54		674	00	12	44
	99	00	08	84		592	00	10	20
	98	00	01	06		593	00	14	24
	97	00	11	66		597	00	15	63
	96	00	00	62		662	00	03	01
	95	00	30	27		598	00	08	77
	474	00	01	97		658	00	00	55
	475	00	10	06		657	00	02	75
	476	00	01	27		604	00	25	23
	1026	00	09	76		653	00	00	97
	744	00	15	51		760	00	21	16
	1022	00	00	95		761	00	01	27
	743	00	10	65		759	00	11	83
	745	00	14	63		758	00	07	80
	741	00	07	21		763	00	00	68
	1050	00	06	29		765	00	08	72
	754	00	06	03		770	00	02	98
	740	00	07	63		768	00	09	16
	755	00	09	55		769	00	03	27
	1051	00	09	58		711	00	00	10
	757	00	17	99		773	00	06	93
	758	00	12	18		772	00	00	43
	759	00	03	24		482	00	00	51
	765	00	16	56		483	00	07	70

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
तिलडापडा (जारी)	480	00	17	76	तैतुलियागिरी (निरत)	88	00	10	30
	467	00	00	71		87	00	08	63
	466	00	03	90		86	00	13	04
	465	00	05	13		55	00	00	64
	468	00	02	92		57	00	10	83
	464	00	06	00		56	00	06	22
	469	00	03	21		63	00	00	70
	470	00	09	38		62	00	11	21
	460	00	01	28		65	00	00	91
	1003	00	07	45		61	00	10	25
	449	00	14	16		66	00	03	21
	446	00	01	04		39	00	01	55
	445	00	00	10		68	00	05	71
	443	00	16	61		69	00	08	42
	444	00	01	00		70	00	05	27
	416	00	04	46		71	00	02	60
	417	00	20	48		37	00	00	75
	419	00	01	99		36	00	08	02
	418	00	15	27		35	00	06	43
	396	00	04	38		172	00	00	10
	495	00	13	58		651	00	02	87
	394	00	01	31		34	00	00	81
	391	00	20	06		173	00	16	77
	384	00	02	19		174	00	00	37
	385	00	02	55		654	00	12	78
	390	00	12	66		178	00	01	40
	388	00	00	14		179	00	08	10
	389	00	02	92		180	00	10	99
	369	00	00	37		199	00	08	06
(13) राजनगर	1256	00	00	10		660	00	00	57
	1255	00	15	25		197	00	06	93
	1254	00	07	07		200	00	00	28
मंडल/तहसील/तालुक : इग्रा-II						198	00	01	04
जिला : मेदिनीपुर						196	00	15	15
राज्य : पश्चिम बंगाल						284	00	01	30
(1) चोलसुंडी	84	00	02	77		695	00	06	10
	89	00	04	64		286	00	05	28
(2) तैतुलियागिरी	90	00	04	57		285	00	05	15
	590	00	03	95		697	00	00	90
	89	00	17	86		698	00	00	12
	94	00	00	68		696	00	09	19

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
पेंडुलियागिरी (जारी)	699	00	02	03	खेजुरडा (निरंतर)	128	00	00	16
	290	00	06	17		131	00	10	86
	292	00	10	87		127	00	01	22
	701	00	00	10		2971	00	10	36
	298	00	11	29		2970	00	09	67
	297	00	06	23		380	00	07	62
	296	00	02	99		384	00	00	42
(3) खेजुरडा	64	00	10	64		383	00	07	70
	63	00	03	35		381	00	06	16
	62	00	02	96		382	00	06	20
	2934	00	05	73		249	00	17	11
	61	00	04	82		250	00	01	04
	60	00	04	20		3026	00	01	52
	8	00	02	21		3025	00	04	93
	59	00	05	11		251	00	00	47
	58	00	00	71		252	00	03	86
	12	00	02	57		3028	00	04	06
	11	00	04	91		253	00	02	01
	2930	00	00	58		258	00	15	27
	2931	00	07	94		255	00	02	33
	14	00	00	35		257	00	12	02
	16	00	20	96		260	00	07	00
	2949	00	06	50		256	00	00	80
	2945	00	02	30		261	00	07	07
	2944	00	06	82		262	00	01	09
	42	00	03	56		339	00	00	01
	48	00	02	91		338	00	12	11
	46	00	07	61		3040	00	01	10
	47	00	09	15		337	00	11	25
	108	00	01	43		265	00	05	33
	109	00	09	00		336	00	03	83
	140	00	10	59		3035	00	06	52
	2964	00	11	80		305	00	08	90
	136	00	10	43		304	00	13	19
	2972	00	01	37		306	00	03	46
	120	00	10	24		307	00	01	34
	130	00	02	36		308	00	01	15
	2973	00	08	51		309	00	18	94
	121	00	00	57		327	00	02	20
	129	00	00	76		312	00	12	57

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
खेजुरहा (जारी)	314	00	15	52
	313	00	01	18
	324	00	06	08
	315	00	07	36
	322	00	06	64
	319	00	06	57
	320	00	22	83
(4) नरमुर्या चक्	21	00	00	10
	112	00	00	34
	3	00	04	18
	2	00	05	52
सर्वे सं. 2 और 156 के बीच में	00	01	33	
	156	00	05	09
	163	00	02	13
	111	00	16	87

[फा. सं. एल. 14014/2/2011-जी.पी.]

के. के. शर्मा, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 28th February, 2011

S.O. 729.—Whereas it appears to Government of India that it is necessary in public interest that for transportation of natural gas from onshore terminal at East Coast of Andhra Pradesh of M/s. Reliance Industries Limited to consumers in various parts of the country, Kakinada - Basudebpur - Howrah pipeline should be laid by M/s. Relogistics Infrastructure Limited;

And whereas, it appears to Government of India that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the Right of User in land under which the said pipeline is proposed to be laid and which are described in the Schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), Government of India hereby declares its intention to acquire the Right of User therein;

Any person interested in the land described in the said Schedule may, within twenty-one days from the date on which the copies of the notification as published in the Gazette of India under sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the said Act, are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of the Right of User therein for laying the pipeline under the land to Shri Barid Baran Guha, Competent Authority, Relogistics Infrastructure Limited, 7, Wood Street, 3rd Floor, Kolkata-700016, West Bengal State.

SCHEDULE				
Mandal/Tehsil/Taluk: Egra-I		District: Medinipur State: West Bengal		
Village	Survey No./ Sub-Division	Area to be acquired for ROU		
		Hec	Are	C-Are
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
(1) Kasbagola	1337	00	00	98
	3306	00	06	61
	1338	00	03	23
	1336	00	01	30
	1335	00	00	10
	1334	00	11	77
	1320	00	00	34
	1321	00	08	73
	1327	00	03	80
	1322	00	04	94
	1316	00	00	10
	1307	00	09	09
	1308	00	01	15
	1312	00	01	40
	1314	00	00	64
	1313	00	06	08
	1311	00	03	50
	1124	00	00	10
	1123	00	00	10
	1121	00	04	21
	1120	00	05	88
	1119	00	00	12
	1118	00	23	43
	1116	00	00	10
	1117	00	05	81
	1097	00	00	10
	1098	00	06	37
	1099	00	04	61
	1100	00	00	16
	1094	00	06	52
	1093	00	00	27
	3245	00	07	36
	1091	00	06	35
	3247	00	00	10
	3283	00	01	63
	3246	00	04	99
	3284	00	00	10

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Kasbagola (Contd.)	1088	00	11	01	Kasbagola (Contd.)	117	00	07	70
	1086	00	00	97		108	00	00	40
	1050	00	05	49		3147	00	01	61
	1084	00	02	75		111	00	01	98
	1051	00	07	56		3148	00	00	10
	3270	00	08	01		3145	00	02	14
	3273	00	00	27		110	00	03	63
	3272	00	02	55		3146	00	01	76
	3271	00	05	91		109	00	07	48
	1061	00	02	58		112	00	02	04
	1052	00	01	09		103	00	01	64
	3061	00	14	93		3172	00	00	10
	1056	00	03	01	(2) Panchrol	3622	00	03	44
	1060	00	07	80		3623	00	09	12
	1058	00	06	08		3783	00	07	93
	28	00	00	87		3624	00	08	19
	1059	00	13	35		3625	00	08	37
	3277	00	04	29		3626	00	11	40
	1036	00	00	78		3837	00	01	68
	1035	00	09	10		2244	00	06	78
	1034	00	08	30		1436	00	13	37
	3264	00	05	47		2437	00	03	44
	29	00	04	17		2439	00	00	59
	137	00	13	99		2438	00	10	24
	138	00	16	20		3830	00	04	41
	140	00	00	10		2440	00	01	96
	139	00	08	17		2441	00	16	42
	135	00	05	07		2442	00	15	26
	134	00	09	85		2453	00	07	83
	133	00	07	01		2456	00	00	21
	3136	00	01	31		2455	00	01	12
	131	00	12	79		2454	00	02	57
	130	00	03	33		2452	00	02	23
	127	00	02	71		2760	00	13	98
	3153	00	05	23		2755	00	02	56
	129	00	01	07		2761	00	05	91
	128	00	09	55		2669	00	15	88
	167	00	01	63		3847	00	07	64
	125	00	00	21		2768	00	03	66
	166	00	09	05		2770	00	01	57
	119	00	10	58		3848	00	00	30
	120	00	00	47					
	118	00	06	81					

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Panchrol (Contd.)	2771	00	08	78	Panchrol (Contd.)	3899	00	09	27
	2772	00	17	08		3505	00	02	38
	2748	00	00	10		3502	00	10	42
	2773	00	08	46		3879	00	05	69
	2774	00	00	10		3501	00	00	35
	2892	00	01	22		3500	00	11	90
	3849	00	02	19		3870	00	00	81
	2777	00	00	15		3497	00	16	56
	2811	00	03	81		3473	00	00	34
	2779	00	06	51		3496	00	02	03
	2810	00	00	10		3902	00	06	90
	2781	00	00	14		3475	00	13	34
	2783	00	02	62		3484	00	00	14
	2780	00	14	12		3876	00	07	12
	2782	00	01	70		3476	00	02	10
	3850	00	01	99		3872	00	08	39
	2808	00	01	40		3482	00	00	10
	2809	00	03	67		3480	00	20	36
	2807	00	01	11		3873	00	00	35
	2806	00	15	16		3419	00	18	61
	2841	00	02	01		3417	00	08	87
	3566	00	01	15		3414	00	01	78
	2846	00	15	53		3415	00	11	00
	2844	00	00	80		3394	00	09	92
	2843	00	01	84		3393	00	03	26
	2845	00	00	75	(3) Rayda	23	00	08	73
	2847	00	00	10		22	00	01	64
	3111	00	01	18		20	00	06	64
	3109	00	11	15		21	00	05	42
	3110	00	00	64		19	00	01	85
	3862	00	00	10		18	00	11	04
	3861	00	01	32		8	00	07	14
	3115	00	01	38		6	00	00	49
	3108	00	15	81		5	00	04	71
	3103	00	01	18		4	00	11	97
	3107	00	07	88		3	00	07	29
	3154	00	14	79		Nala bet suy	00	01	44
	3156	00	02	42		No. 3 & VB			
	3155	00	12	50	(4) Bilbara	Nala bet VB &	00	01	70
	3507	00	00	10		suy No. 389			
	3158	00	14	89		389	00	36	54
	3506	00	00	43		397	00	16	59
	3504	00	10	75		396	00	04	65
						395	00	09	18

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Bilbara (Contd.)		399	00	02	19	Alangiri (Contd.)		1630	00	13	54
		400	00	08	15			4269	00	16	02
		489	00	08	18			1628	00	01	70
		590	00	00	18			1629	00	19	75
		488	00	04	62			1588	00	17	25
		487	00	02	96			1606	00	00	22
		467	00	02	96			1605	00	14	31
		468	00	01	48			4514	00	00	10
		486	00	16	91			1604	00	07	36
		588	00	00	22			1602	00	00	65
		485	00	11	16			1603	00	11	91
		483	00	11	35			4516	00	21	21
		484	00	02	04			4520	00	07	85
		842	00	03	59			1597	00	00	11
		586	00	03	96			1598	00	05	37
		587	00	01	79			1594	00	11	47
		480	00	19	17			1595	00	00	67
		456	00	00	15			1596	00	08	36
(5) Baya		7	00	00	43			1946	00	01	47
		6	00	18	72			1942	00	09	49
		5	00	03	11			1940	00	03	53
		In bet suy no. 5 & 83	00	06	44			1941	00	09	30
		83	00	00	10			1936	00	01	75
		37	00	10	82			1943	00	02	93
		226	00	14	61			1938	00	05	33
(6) Alangiri		1531	00	04	59			1937	00	27	67
		1657	00	00	10			4593	00	11	21
		1655	00	06	03			4106	00	01	76
		1534	00	01	72			4110	00	10	85
		1656	00	05	47			4111	00	00	10
		1642	00	10	63			3376	00	12	71
		1641	00	10	52			3375	00	02	91
		1640	00	00	43			3374	00	00	10
		1645	00	04	21			4113	00	19	74
		1646	00	00	50			4118	00	00	86
		1647	00	12	84			3363	00	13	75
		1648	00	01	40			3362	00	15	31
		1649	00	05	38			3357	00	02	16
		1635	00	15	72			3361	00	04	90
		1564	00	03	74			3358	00	09	28
		637	00	13	78			3356	00	05	64
		1632	00	04	74			4712	00	12	39

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Alangiri (Contd.)	3272	00	03	31	Alangiri (Contd.)	3083	00	00	41
	3273	00	09	98		3082	00	11	41
	3274	00	01	79		3081	00	11	52
	3237	00	06	16	(7) Jerthan	42	00	00	10
	3236	00	05	92		40	00	08	29
	3235	00	22	36		41	00	07	35
	3230	00	00	35		39	00	10	98
	4684	00	16	13		3	00	12	30
	3231	00	09	16		4049	00	07	96
	3226	00	02	09		4	00	01	26
	3225	00	07	88		5	00	12	30
	3223	00	02	55		6	00	14	39
	3224	00	14	32		9	00	01	05
	3218	00	09	89		13	00	13	36
	3217	00	03	55		12	00	07	74
	3186	00	00	26		14	00	08	58
	3185	00	19	98		11	00	00	40
	3187	00	08	98		15	00	12	50
	3188	00	08	23		16	00	01	67
	3180	00	09	13		17	00	14	19
	3179	00	00	83		18	00	04	73
	3177	00	05	41	(8) Katabani	460	00	00	10
	3152	00	03	55		461	00	14	64
	3153	00	01	27		475	00	04	34
	3141	00	04	58		462	00	02	55
	3154	00	07	43		474	00	13	05
	3155	00	10	26		473	00	01	53
	3156	00	08	97		472	00	09	89
	3118	00	19	97		471	00	05	04
	3117	00	10	17		480	00	13	47
	3115	00	00	10		469	00	08	62
	3116	00	05	55		484	00	16	98
	4658	00	00	57		485	00	00	45
	3107	00	06	65		410	00	03	33
	3108	00	03	51		409	00	05	73
	4657	00	07	20		408	00	03	28
	4656	00	06	13		346	00	01	82
	3094	00	15	83		345	00	08	25
	3090	00	01	11		344	00	11	78
	3086	00	08	77		342	00	00	18
	4646	00	07	66		343	00	02	81
	3087	00	00	35					

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Katabani (Contd.)	576	00	00	78	Ulua (Contd.)	44	00	12	83
	327	00	16	20		213	00	00	18
	326	00	04	12		45	00	07	76
	328	00	00	50		46	00	18	49
	325	00	07	80		47	00	00	10
	322	00	01	17		161	00	05	40
	323	00	12	73		159	00	00	64
	324	00	00	66		52	00	08	69
	315	00	07	13		51	00	00	55
	306	00	01	53		158	00	01	64
	314	00	00	15		53	00	06	84
	308	00	06	80		339	00	02	29
	307	00	02	34		353	00	01	14
	309	00	02	53		54	00	11	67
	258	00	06	88		155	00	03	33
	574	00	01	34		56	00	15	62
	260	00	03	34		110	00	13	22
	261	00	01	71		323	00	00	20
	262	00	00	19		109	00	00	27
	263	00	01	29		108	00	03	46
	259	00	01	21		107	00	12	15
	255	00	05	28		104	00	01	32
	264	00	00	29		100	00	08	26
	254	00	03	17		101	00	01	19
	253	00	01	63		102	00	08	28
	252	00	00	39		98	00	00	59
	251	00	01	37		97	00	01	70
	249	00	08	86		96	00	01	06
	250	00	00	25		95	00	02	06
	230	00	00	17		94	00	02	00
	248	00	00	75		92	00	01	40
	232	00	02	14		88	00	28	62
	233	00	02	58		82	00	00	24
	235	00	09	26		81	00	11	34
	234	00	01	17		80	00	03	28
	236	00	08	00	(10) Benachakri	851	00	30	44
	189	00	00	35		852	00	03	87
(9) Ulua	215	00	00	96		1097	00	01	43
	336	00	15	15		858	00	08	80
	338	00	00	84		1096	00	11	16
	40	00	09	01		857	00	02	91
	333	00	00	19		861	00	03	49
	41	00	05	54		862	00	07	95
	214	00	00	14		863	00	08	60

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Benachakri	866	00	03	53	Naraharipur	19	00	00	64
(Contd.)	864	00	01	87	(Contd.)	18	00	11	95
	865	00	03	79		17	00	00	90
	867	00	03	03		15	00	01	04
	974	00	01	19		13	00	02	15
	973	00	05	12		40	00	18	82
	972	00	05	72		41	00	01	91
	1087	00	07	24		42	00	07	28
	976	00	03	28		45	00	04	39
	1088	00	07	71		43	00	00	18
	1089	00	01	65		44	00	03	53
	967	00	23	85		371	00	02	55
	966	00	23	72		47	00	15	74
	1080	00	03	18		46	00	00	47
	907	00	02	38		52	00	10	40
	909	00	00	14		53	00	10	16
	933	00	01	78		54	00	00	94
	929	00	02	85		373	00	02	08
	928	00	14	17		55	00	09	78
	927	00	11	37		57	00	00	51
	64	00	03	86		366	00	00	79
(11) Satkhanda	1	00	00	53		365	00	09	78
(12) Naraharipur	144	00	00	17		56	00	04	65
	137	00	16	75		360	00	02	51
	136	00	03	85		361	00	02	45
	135	00	02	21		58	00	07	43
	138	00	00	86		362	00	00	89
	134	00	03	62		363	00	07	31
	133	00	02	79		364	00	03	60
	132	00	03	67		59	00	00	16
	131	00	04	98		62	00	04	35
	127	00	07	82	(13) Kudi	49	00	00	10
	128	00	02	31		300	00	01	44
	126	00	05	03		289	00	12	72
	125	00	03	22		288	00	23	70
	124	00	00	36		287	00	00	25
	27	00	00	27		284	00	00	48
	23	00	01	44		285	00	14	42
	20	00	04	54		2320	00	00	10
	24	00	00	70		262	00	24	96
	25	00	03	75		1611	00	04	56
						263	00	08	18

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Kudi (Contd.)	265	00	01	92	Hosenpur (Contd.)	26	00	08	54
	264	00	03	13		In bet suy	00	17	20
	290	00	02	11		no. 26 & 21			
	258	00	05	69		21	00	15	06
	259	00	05	69		18	00	02	13
	1305	00	01	62		20	00	09	23
	239	00	00	10	(15) Ramkrishanapur	182	00	02	59
	240	00	18	42		4	00	07	46
	241	00	08	65		3	00	04	39
	238	00	00	87		416	00	08	50
	242	00	10	41		6	00	16	57
	236	00	36	11		10	00	03	53
	212	00	05	74		425	00	14	39
	224	00	01	09		9	00	00	11
	213	00	00	29		424	00	01	02
	222	00	15	82		11	00	16	44
	215	00	14	07		12	00	00	57
	216	00	22	18	(16) Bastia	672	00	10	17
	217	00	01	36		673	00	16	73
	218	00	00	56		675	00	01	25
	199	00	25	65		674	00	11	37
	201	00	00	22		650	00	01	43
	198	00	22	04		649	00	05	66
	197	00	06	80		648	00	09	25
	157	00	13	53		646	00	21	40
	189	00	11	13		647	00	03	09
	188	00	06	05	(17) Dalulua	645	00	00	80
	160	00	07	37		278	00	14	19
	187	00	00	92		276	00	10	34
	165	00	11	91		280	00	02	31
	166	00	11	04		281	00	09	21
	1296	00	05	65		960	00	11	22
	167	00	08	26		282	00	01	09
	171	00	00	98		962	00	00	54
	170	00	12	56		961	00	12	81
(14) Hosenpur	35	00	13	18		285	00	12	78
	36	00	15	61		1056	00	00	43
	37	00	12	56	(18) Ulipur	421	00	01	19
	33	00	02	02		419	00	00	66
	43	00	07	23		422	00	00	33
	32	00	13	72		562	00	11	46
	30	00	09	72		420	00	03	59
	29	00	07	33		556	00	09	41

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Ulipur (Contd.)	563	00	01	69	Purbbachak Alua	194	00	00	39
	558	00	00	24	(Contd.)	124	00	06	47
	555	00	01	18		126	00	06	06
	557	00	21	30		112	00	22	20
	415	00	02	41		113	00	00	60
	533	00	08	21		107	00	09	42
	538	00	00	12		111	00	04	96
	354	00	01	38		109	00	00	90
	355	00	15	34		231	00	10	43
	536	00	01	18		108	00	05	48
	535	00	06	68		230	00	05	32
	357	00	01	24		229	00	11	76
	358	00	05	47		91	00	00	74
	534	00	00	10		79	00	03	47
	359	00	25	32		78	00	00	15
	368	00	01	54		80	00	13	67
	369	00	07	05		66	00	27	89
	367	00	00	10		67	00	13	85
	546	00	13	24		64	00	01	90
	372	00	08	14		57	00	01	62
	244	00	00	32		58	00	06	21
	243	00	03	48		56	00	00	10
	505	00	06	40		59	00	07	39
	373	00	00	21		33	00	00	10
	504	00	01	11		60	00	02	62
	548	00	04	73		32	00	07	91
	591	00	04	25		217	00	08	27
	590	00	00	10		31	00	04	07
	252	00	10	07		30	00	01	22
(19) Purbbachak Alua	130	00	06	17		In bet suy	00	05	59
	176	00	00	10		no. 30 & 214			
	256	00	00	40		214	00	00	08
	131	00	26	99	(20) Kasba Egra	28	00	00	10
	174	00	00	42		In bet VB &	00	00	10
	132	00	15	65		suy no. 3844			
	134	00	00	79		3844	00	00	46
	129	00	03	72		3845	00	13	73
	135	00	13	77		3864	00	06	45
	128	00	02	65		3846	00	04	70
	125	00	11	95		3863	00	03	00
						3862	00	05	57
						3860	00	14	66
						3859	00	00	15

Mandal/Tehsil/Taluk : Mohanpur		District : Medinipur State: West Bengal			(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(3) Agarara				
(1) Nilpura	71	00	00	95		1016	00	00	24
	72	00	05	67		1017	00	01	61
	75	00	08	56		927	00	06	75
	77	00	06	45		928	00	14	58
	74	00	01	39		931	00	12	59
	78	00	16	46		929	00	00	48
	63	00	00	53		930	00	21	75
	62	00	13	59	(4) Sandapura	35	00	29	56
	60	00	16	55		37	00	03	81
	56	00	02	98		180	00	02	25
	1743	00	15	67		38	00	02	66
	1835	00	02	06		39	00	00	71
	1742	00	01	61		179	00	05	88
	1741	00	00	20		769	00	09	23
	48	00	38	56		172	00	00	85
	47	00	01	17		174	00	00	22
	42	00	08	30		173	00	09	99
	41	00	03	00		168	00	00	10
	39	00	03	87		171	00	00	38
	37	00	16	38		170	00	04	85
	36	00	01	70		169	00	01	42
	35	00	08	10		175	00	00	10
	33	00	12	59		162	00	14	95
	32	00	01	91		163	00	00	45
	209	00	14	89		161	00	02	25
	41	00	15	45		391	00	06	17
	40	00	00	11		151	00	13	53
	177	00	12	56		152	00	02	15
	39	00	00	10		153	00	00	10
	176	00	09	46		389	00	09	81
	54	00	04	33		147	00	04	59
	38	00	04	33		142	00	01	87
	175	00	10	63		388	00	03	20
	35	00	00	91		145	00	00	99
	46	00	15	72		387	00	02	54
	33	00	02	65		146	00	02	19
	32	00	04	97		140	00	00	95
	31	00	01	48		144	00	02	43
	171	00	00	36		134	00	00	80
	29	00	12	80		135	00	05	11
	30	00	07	12		136	00	00	10
	73	00	00	20		139	00	05	75
	74	00	07	75		137	00	01	65
(2) Asura									

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Sandapura (Contd.)	138	00	01	93	Paluya (Contd.)	287	00	02	65
	129	00	03	41		288	00	00	54
	386	00	04	48		277	00	00	82
	385	00	00	11		286	00	13	77
	128	00	26	68		284	00	02	15
	119	00	03	36		290	00	06	31
	122	00	00	98		674	00	00	10
	121	00	07	58		291	00	22	66
	120	00	00	20		667	00	04	35
	109	00	22	00		672	00	00	30
(5) Tarania	692	00	00	34		668	00	19	88
	949	00	09	39		665	00	10	33
	688	00	00	26		664	00	09	05
	689	00	02	01		663	00	04	04
	950	00	01	14		662	00	00	33
	948	00	18	49		317	00	15	03
	687	00	00	10		922	00	01	57
	690	00	01	91		647	00	14	29
	696	00	15	53		645	00	15	39
	697	00	00	51		646	00	02	12
	951	00	15	10		644	00	01	72
	698	00	00	10		558	00	11	65
	852	00	27	37		559	00	00	46
	843	00	07	54		560	00	01	76
	847	00	14	07		557	00	04	64
	848	00	00	08		556	00	04	49
	877	00	49	04		551	00	06	85
	965	00	00	24		552	00	09	68
(6) Paluya	847	00	08	24		550	00	01	38
	846	00	06	32		513	00	02	52
	848	00	00	18	(7) Tanuya	3077	00	00	47
	854	00	11	60		3078	00	00	81
	856	00	09	96		3079	00	04	51
	852	00	00	52		3080	00	05	20
	653	00	18	71		3081	00	14	11
	859	00	20	59		3022	00	01	47
	954	00	11	41		3021	00	03	68
	861	00	05	26		3083	00	00	11
	860	00	19	21		3084	00	08	85
	869	00	02	03		3085	00	02	85
	870	00	16	91		3086	00	00	31
	872	00	00	21		3087	00	03	86
	871	00	18	98					

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
(8) Kasichak	204	00	01	66	Mitinia (Contd.)	712	00	04	85
	195	00	03	48		713	00	02	41
	181	00	04	63		704	00	01	80
	190	00	00	68		707	00	00	95
	188	00	06	71		708	00	05	91
	187	00	03	32		710	00	00	58
	56	00	05	18		709	00	02	84
	48	00	06	22		725	00	00	74
	51	00	01	03		726	00	05	86
	50	00	14	57		721	00	05	65
	49	00	00	51		352	00	01	29
	57	00	02	88		728	00	02	45
	58	00	04	19		730	00	09	47
	387	00	05	53		300	00	14	85
	59	00	00	70		640	00	01	13
	64	00	06	10		623	00	07	60
	72	00	07	89		624	00	10	54
	65	00	01	38		626	00	01	31
	73	00	02	45		625	00	06	24
	71	00	04	55		622	00	00	10
	74	00	08	70		618	00	20	99
	389	00	01	64		616	00	10	96
	388	00	01	82		784	00	01	13
	75	00	03	77		599	00	05	28
	77	00	01	04		592	00	11	23
	78	00	00	10		606	00	04	73
	76	00	08	34		590	00	10	69
	79	00	00	90		589	00	07	12
	385	00	00	11		588	00	05	47
(9) Mitinia	424	00	12	64		587	00	03	06
	686	00	00	57		586	00	02	64
	685	00	00	75	(10) Mayurkhola	100	00	07	54
	687	00	04	06		99	00	08	84
	688	00	05	51		98	00	01	06
	690	00	02	02		97	00	11	66
	689	00	04	65		96	00	00	62
	684	00	03	97		95	00	30	27
	683	00	00	21		474	00	01	97
	700	00	03	72		475	00	10	06
	699	00	01	99		476	00	01	27
	701	00	09	65		1026	00	09	76
	714	00	06	62		744	00	15	51
	711	00	02	80		1022	00	00	95

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Mayurkhola (Contd.)	743	00	10	65	Tildapara (Contd.)	760	00	21	16
	745	00	14	63		761	00	01	27
	741	00	07	21		759	00	11	83
	1050	00	06	29		758	00	07	80
	754	00	06	03		763	00	00	68
	740	00	07	63		765	00	08	72
	755	00	09	55		770	00	02	98
	1051	00	09	58		768	00	09	16
	757	00	17	99		769	00	03	27
	758	00	12	18		711	00	00	10
	759	00	03	24		773	00	06	93
	765	00	16	56		772	00	00	43
(11) Gara	468	00	01	88		482	00	00	51
	519	00	00	10		483	00	07	70
	470	00	06	39		480	00	17	76
	471	00	10	68		467	00	00	71
	472	00	13	01		466	00	03	90
	477	00	00	57		465	00	05	13
	540	00	10	56		468	00	02	92
	581	00	09	18		464	00	06	00
	473	00	13	82		469	00	03	21
	474	00	07	85		470	00	09	38
	511	00	05	42		460	00	01	28
	510	00	03	17		1003	00	07	45
	512	00	17	11		449	00	14	16
(12) Tildapara	676	00	12	26		446	00	01	04
	675	00	11	64		445	00	00	10
	1015	00	02	65		443	00	16	61
	674	00	12	44		444	00	01	00
	592	00	10	20		416	00	04	46
	593	00	14	24		417	00	20	48
	597	00	15	63		419	00	01	99
	662	00	03	01		418	00	15	27
	598	00	08	77		396	00	04	38
	658	00	00	55		495	00	13	58
	657	00	02	75		394	00	01	31
	604	00	25	23		391	00	20	06
	653	00	00	97		384	00	02	19

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
(12) Tildapara (Contd.)	385 390 388 389 369	00 00 00 00 00	02 12 00 02 00	55 66 14 92 37	Tentuliagiri (Contd.)	173 174 654 178 179	00 00 00 00 00	16 00 12 01 08	77 37 78 40 10
(13) Rajnagar	1256 1255 1254	00 00 00	00 15 07	10 25 07		180 199 660 197 200	00 00 00 00 00	10 08 00 06 00	99 06 57 93 28
Manda/Tehsil/Taluk:Egra-II District : Medinipur State : West Bengal						198 196 284 695 286 285 697 698 696 699 290 292 701 298 297 296	00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00	01 15 01 06 05 05 00 00 09 02 06 10 00 11 06 02	04 15 30 10 28 15 90 12 19 03 17 87 10 29 23 59
(1) Ghoshundi	84 89	00 00	02 04	77 64					
(2) Tentuliagiri	90 590 89 94 88 87 86 55 57 56 63 62 65 61 66 39 68 69 70 71 37 36 35 172 651 34	00 00	04 03 17 00 10 08 13 00 10 06 00 11 00 10 03 01 05 08 05 02 00 08 06 00 02 00	57 95 86 68 30 63 04 64 83 22 70 21 91 25 21 55 71 42 27 60 75 02 43 10 87 81	(3) Khejurda	64 63 62 2934 61 60 8 59 58 12 11 2930	00 00	10 03 02 05 04 04 02 05 04 02 04 02 04 02 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00	64 35 96 73 82 20 21 11 71 57 91 58

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Khejurda (Contd.)	2931	00	07	94	Khejurda (Contd.)	253	00	02	01
	14	00	00	35		258	00	15	27
	16	00	20	96		255	00	02	33
	2949	00	06	50		257	00	12	02
	2945	00	02	30		260	00	07	00
	2944	00	06	82		256	00	00	80
	42	00	03	56		261	00	07	07
	48	00	02	91		262	00	01	09
	46	00	07	61		339	00	00	01
	47	00	09	15		338	00	12	11
	108	00	01	43		3040	00	01	10
	109	00	09	00		337	00	11	25
	140	00	10	59		265	00	05	33
	2964	00	11	80		336	00	03	83
	136	00	10	43		3035	00	06	52
	2972	00	01	37		305	00	08	90
	120	00	10	24		304	00	13	19
	130	00	02	36		306	00	03	46
	2973	00	08	51		307	00	01	34
	121	00	00	57		308	00	01	15
	129	00	00	76		309	00	18	94
	128	00	00	16		327	00	02	20
	131	00	10	86		312	00	12	57
	127	00	01	22		314	00	15	52
	2971	00	10	36		313	00	01	18
	2970	00	09	67		324	00	06	08
	380	00	07	62		315	00	07	36
	384	00	00	42		322	00	06	64
	383	00	07	70		319	00	06	57
	381	00	06	16	(4) Narubhunya Chak	320	00	22	83
	382	00	06	20		21	00	00	10
	249	00	17	11		112	00	00	34
	250	00	01	04		3	00	04	18
	3026	00	01	52		2	00	05	52
	3025	00	04	93		In bet suy no. 2 & 156	00	01	33
	251	00	00	47		156	00	05	09
	252	00	03	86		163	00	02	13
	3028	00	04	06		111	00	16	87

[F. No. L-14014/2/2011]-GP]

K. K. SHARMA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 21 फरवरी, 2011

का.आ. 730.—भारत सरकार को लोकहित में यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि तमिलनाडु में तिरुतुनी के पास विजयवाड़ा-नैल्लोर-चैन्नई पाइपलाइन के टर्मिनल प्वाइंट से देश के विभिन्न हिस्सों में उपभोक्तों तक प्राकृतिक गैस के परिवहन के लिए मैसर्स रिलोजिस्टिक्स इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर लिमिटेड द्वारा चैन्नई-बंगलौर-मंगलौर पाइपलाइन बिछाई जानी चाहिए;

और, भारत सरकार को उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि उस भूमि में, जिसके भीतर उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाई जाने का प्रस्ताव है और जो इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित है, उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाए;

अतः अब, भारत सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उनमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है;

कोई व्यक्ति, जो उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध है, उस तारीख से, जिसको उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन जारी की गई अधिसूचना की प्रतियाँ साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती हैं, इक्कीस दिन के भीतर भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाई जाने के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन के संबंध में श्री के. मल्लीनाथ, सक्षम प्राधिकारी, रिलोजिस्टिक्स इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर लिमिटेड, 74, दूसरी मंजिल, प्रेस्टीज फ्लोरज, कनिगाहाम रोड, बंगलौर-560052, कर्नाटक राज्य को लिखित रूप में आक्षेप भेज सकेगा।

अनुसूची

तालुक : चींतामणी	जिला : चीकवल्लीपुर	राज्य : कर्नाटक
गाँव का नाम	सर्वे सं./ सब डिविजन सं.	आर. ओ. यू. अर्जित करने के लिए क्षेत्रफल हेक्टेयर एयर सि एयर
(1)	(2)	(3) (4) (5)
(1) जंगमपुरा	16	00 71 33
	13	00 44 16
	सर्वे नं. 13 में नाला	00 00 78
	10	00 10 02
	सर्वे नं. 10 में नाला	00 03 38
	11	00 07 77
	12	00 13 28
	सर्वे नं. 12 और 6 के बीच में नाला	00 07 60

1	2	3	4	5
जंगमपुरा (जारी)	6	00	20	29
	5	00	10	28
	सर्वे नं. 5 और 4 के बीच में नाला	00	01	77
	4	00	07	55
	43	00	01	32
	सर्वे नं. 43 और 3 के बीच में नाला	00	03	34
	3	00	25	77
	42	00	42	61
	40	00	25	30
	39	00	37	96
(2) होसहल्ली	110	00	31	28
	111	00	16	54
	112	00	22	07
	113	00	00	73
	सर्वे नं. 112 और 119 के बीच में नाला	00	05	08
	119	00	32	80
	145	00	41	72
	146	00	34	95
	156	00	31	64
	155	00	53	36
	154	00	39	15
	152	00	31	54
	153	00	01	99
	सर्वे नं. 153 और 175 के बीच में एस एच 82	00	08	54
	175	00	18	72
	266	00	04	96
	176	00	16	01
	177	00	19	43
	179	00	12	45
	178	00	94	61
	191	00	50	49
	192	00	26	64
	202	00	21	93
	203	00	31	25
	सर्वे नं. 203 और गाँव सीमा के बीच में भूमि	00	02	47

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
(3) सुब्बरायनपेटे	59	00	28	72	देवरहोसहल्ली	162 के बीच में			
	60	00	05	07	(जारी)	नाला			
तालुक : दोडवल्लीपुर	जिला : बंगलुरु	रूरल	राज्य : कर्नाटक			152	00	78	34
(1) कार्नाला	26	00	49	33	(2) हलेनिजगल	सर्वे नं. 76 और	00	02	65
	29	00	25	50		75 के बीच में भूमि			
	28	00	35	66		158	00	09	97
	40	00	78	83		159	00	04	88
	43	00	44	69		160	00	31	25
सर्वे नं. 43 और	00	09	98			161	00	18	00
49 के बीच में						33	00	28	42
रास्ता						31	00	22	66
49	00	83	60			7	00	52	59
सर्वे नं. 49 और	00	07	77			4	00	00	61
152 के बीच में						3	00	05	00
रोड़						2	00	4	18
152	00	15	20			17	00	44	56
154	00	02	10			18	00	07	35
153	00	03	51			21	00	25	73
155	00	15	20			सर्वे नं. 33 और	00	08	53
50	00	50	39			61 के बीच में			
51	00	23	56			रोड़			
159	00	20	25			58	00	00	85
तालुक : नेलमंगल	जिला : बंगलुरु	रूरल	राज्य : कर्नाटक			61	00	42	86
(1) देवरहोसल्ली	149	00	00	33		60	00	00	49
	154	00	73	89		सर्वे नं. 61 और	00	15	15
	155	00	32	72		79 के बीच में			
	156	00	27	84		रेलवे रास्ता			
	157	00	21	68		22	00	25	50
सर्वे नं. 154 और	00	03	24			73	00	09	07
153 के बीच में						72	00	28	73
रास्ता						70	00	01	55
162	00	31	73			68	00	18	24
सर्वे नं. 162 और	00	05	04			79	00	10	88
157 के बीच में						77	00	21	98
भूमि						74	00	32	21
142	00	65	51			180	00	04	06
161	00	35	11			32	00	17	38
153	00	08	56			75	00	05	15
सर्वे नं. 161 और	00	13	04			76	00	16	13

New Delhi, the 21st February, 2011

S.O. 730.—Whereas it appears to Government of India that it is necessary in public interest that for transportation of natural gas from terminal point of Vijayawada-Nellore-Chennai pipeline near Tiruttani in Tamil Nadu to consumers in various parts of the country, Chennai-Bangalore-Mangalore pipeline should be laid by M/s. Relogistics Infrastructure Limited;

And, whereas, it appears to Government of India that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the Right of User in land under which the said pipeline is proposed to be laid and which are described in the Schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962. (50 of 1962), Government of India hereby declares its intention to acquire the Right of User therein;

Any person interested in the land described in the said Schedule may, within twenty-one days from the date on which the copies of the notification as published in the Gazette of India under sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the said Act, are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of the Right of User therein for laying the pipeline under the land to Shri K. Mallinath, Competent Authority, Relogistics Infrastructure Limited, #74, 2nd Floor, Prestige Feroze, Cunningham Road, Bangalore-560052, Karnataka State.

SCHEDULE

Taluk : Chintamani District : Chikballapur State :
Karnataka

Name of Village	Survey No./ Sub- Division No.	Area to be acquired for RoU Hectare	Are	C-Are
-----------------	-------------------------------------	---	-----	-------

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
(1) Jangamapura	16	00	71	33
	13	00	44	16
	Nala in the Sy. No. 13	00	00	78
	10	00	10	02
	Nala in the Sy. No. 10	00	03	38
	11	00	07	77
	12	00	13	28
	Nala in between Sy. No. 12 & 6	00	07	60
	6	00	20	29
	5	00	10	28

1	2	3	4	5
Jangmapura Contd.	Nala in between Sy. No.5 & 4	00	01	77
	4	00	07	55
	43	00	01	32
	Nala in between Sy. No 43 & 3	00	03	34
	3	00	25	77
	42	00	42	61
	40	00	25	30
	39	00	37	96
(2) Hosahalli	110	00	31	28
	111	00	16	54
	112	00	22	07
	113	00	00	73
	Nala in between Sy. No. 112 & 119	00	05	08
	119	00	32	80
	145	00	41	72
	146	00	34	95
	156	00	31	64
	155	00	53	36
	154	00	39	15
	152	00	31	54
	153	00	01	99
	S.H.82 in between Sy. No 153 & 175	00	08	54
	175	00	18	72
	266	00	04	96
	176	00	16	01
	177	00	19	43
	179	00	12	45
	178	00	94	61
	191	00	50	49
	192	00	26	64
	202	00	21	93
	203	00	31	25
	Cart track in between Sy. No. 203 & V.B	00	02	47
(3) Subbaraya- napete	59	00	28	72
	60	00	05	07

Taluk : Dodballapur District:Bangalore Rural
State: Karnataka

(1) Kaarnala	26	00	49	33
	29	00	25	50

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Kaarnala	28	00	35	66	(2) Halenijagal	31	00	22	66
Contd.	40	00	78	83	Contd.	7	00	52	59
	43	00	44	69		4	00	00	61
Cart track in		00	09	98		3	00	05	00
between Sy. No.						2	00	04	56
43 & 49						17	00	44	56
49	00	83	60			18	00	07	35
Road in between	00	07	77			21	00	25	73
Sy. No. 49 & 152						Road in between	00	08	53
152	00	15	20			Sy. No. 33 & 61			
154	00	02	10			58	00	00	85
153	00	03	51			61	00	42	86
155	00	15	20			60	00	00	49
50	00	50	39			Railway track in	00	15	15
51	00	23	56			between Sy.			
159	00	20	25			61 & 79			
Taluk : Nelamangala	District : Bangalore Rural					22	00	25	50
	State : Karnataka					73	00	09	07
(1) Devaraho-	149	00	00	33		72	00	28	73
sahalli						70	00	01	55
	154	00	73	89		68	00	18	24
	155	00	32	72		79	00	10	88
	156	00	27	84		77	00	21	98
	157	00	21	68		74	00	32	21
Cart track in		00	03	24		180	00	04	06
between Sy.						32	00	17	38
No. 154 & 153						75	00	05	15
162	00	31	73			76	00	16	13
Land in between	00	05	04						
Sy. No. 162 & 157									
142	00	65	51						
161	00	35	11						
153	00	08	56						
Nala in between	00	13	04						
Sy. No. 161 & 162									
152	00	78	34						
(2) Halenijagal	Land in between	00	02	65					
	Sy. No. 76 & 75								
	158	00	09	97					
	159	00	04	88					
	160	00	31	35					
	161	00	18	00					
	33	00	28	42					

[F. No. L-14014/81/2010-GP]

K. K. SHARMA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 21 फरवरी, 2011

का.आ. 731.—भारत सरकार को लोकहित में यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि तमिलनाडु में तिरुतुनी के पास विजयवाड़ा-नैल्सोर-चैन्नई पाइपलाइन के टर्मिनल प्वाइंट से देश के विभिन्न हिस्सों में उपभोक्ताओं तक प्राकृतिक गैस के परिवहन के लिए मैसर्स रिलोजिस्टिक्स इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर लिमिटेड द्वारा चैन्नई-बंगलौर-मंगलौर पाइपलाइन बिछाई जानी चाहिए;

और, भारत सरकार को उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि उस भूमि में, जिसके भीतर उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाई जाने का प्रस्ताव है और जो इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित है, उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाए;

अतः अब, भारत सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उनमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है;

कोई व्यक्ति, जो उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध है, उस तारीख से, जिसको उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन जारी की गई अधिसूचना की प्रतियाँ साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती हैं, इक्कीस दिन के भीतर भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार के अर्जन करने के संबंध में श्री के. मल्लीनाथ, सक्षम प्राधिकारी, रिलोजिस्टिक्स इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर लिमिटेड, 74, दूसरी मंजिल, प्रेस्टीज फेरोज, कनिंगहम रोड, बंगलौर-560052, कर्नाटक राज्य को लिखित रूप में आक्षेप भेज सकेगा।

अनुसूची

तालुक : तुमकूर		जिला : तुमकूर		राज्य : कर्नाटक	
क्रम सं.	गाँव का नाम	सर्वे सं./सब डिविजन सं.	आर.ओ.यू. अर्जित करने के लिए क्षेत्रफल हेक्टेयर	एयर	सि एयर
1	2	3	4	5	5
(1) नंदिहल्ली	40	00	02	72	
	87	00	00	10	
	86	00	47	90	
	41	00	33	01	
	101	00	44	05	
	42	03	24	52	
तालुक : हासन		जिला : हासन		राज्य : कर्नाटक	
(1) सिद्धपुरा	21	00	59	79	
	19/3	00	30	47	
	19/5	00	10	09	
	सर्वे नं. 17 और 20 के बीच में नाला	00	05	47	
	20/1	00	22	36	
	20/2	00	00	10	
	17/2	00	25	63	
	17/1	00	71	26	
	16/8	00	00	99	
	16/9	00	14	55	
	16/10	00	09	77	
	16/5	00	00	15	

1	2	3	4	5
सिद्धपुरा (जारी)	16/6	00	10	17
	7/1	00	14	50
	6/2	00	19	53
	सर्वे नं. 6 और 7 के बीच में रोड़	00	04	85
	सर्वे नं. 6 और 7 के बीच में रेलवे रास्ता	00	06	42
	7/1	00	12	63
	7/2	00	09	14
	8/1	00	13	69
	99	00	11	34
	सर्वे नं. 99 और 91 के बीच में रोड़	00	08	95
	90/4	00	00	10
	91/1	00	87	82
	92	00	00	10
	88/2	00	31	15
	93/2	00	03	67
(2) कारेबारे काव्लु	93/1	00	01	96
	84	00	82	20
	1	00	26	87
	2	00	21	20
	247	00	29	18
	246	00	03	98
	248	00	11	63
	सर्वे नं. 248 और 238 के बीच में नाला	00	05	72
	238	00	49	27
	239	00	01	47
	237	00	03	37
	240	00	02	51
	48	00	73	48
	49	00	00	33
	सर्वे नं. 48 और 50 के बीच में नाला	00	02	02
	47	00	19	56
	50	00	35	07
	51	00	50	81

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
कारेबारे कावलु	52	00	50	64	(5) होन्नावरा	99/1	00	02	58
(जारी)	53	00	49	97		99/2	00	14	28
	54	00	45	38		101	00	15	21
	55	00	10	80		100/1	00	00	51
(3) हुलेनहल्ली	49	00	00	10		100/2	00	06	54
(4) चिंगटिहल्ली	21	00	00	10		100/3	00	08	61
	24	01	09	82		100/4	00	00	50
	23	00	16	86		132	00	09	32
	22/5	00	22	29		131	00	09	97
	22/4	00	10	64		129	00	06	79
	22/6	00	06	11		130	00	19	79
	22/7	00	10	16		128	00	05	30
	4/1	00	10	34		127/1	00	08	37
	5/1	00	09	28		127/2	00	05	57
	5/2	00	08	49		सर्वे नं. 127 और	00	04	57
	5/3	00	06	49		200 के बीच में			
	6	00	07	77		रोड़			
	7/2	00	13	89		200	00	00	97
	7/1	00	13	11		201	00	11	12
	8	00	14	99		202	00	05	94
	9	00	39	15		203	00	14	12
	10	00	01	95		204	00	04	01
सर्वे नं. 10 और		00	09	99		295	00	04	27
56 के बीच में भूमि						206	00	06	27
56/1		00	00	21		208	00	19	46
56/2		00	01	69		209	00	07	59
56/3		00	17	96		210	00	04	32
56/4		00	18	01		211	00	04	08
56/5		00	11	42		212	00	04	54
57/1		00	01	77		213	00	04	35
सर्वे नं. 57 और		00	12	50		214	00	06	76
47 के बीच में						215	00	01	04
भूमि						सर्वे नं. 215 और	00	04	07
47/2		00	22	89		261 के बीच में			
47/1		00	03	11		रोड़			
42/1		00	13	67		261/1	00	00	54
42/2		00	14	40		261/2	00	01	96
42/3		00	10	15		260	00	07	33
41/3		00	27	37		259/1	00	11	37
41/4		00	10	21		259/2	00	18	58
41/5		00	02	20		273	00	18	00
40		00	17	76		257	00	19	89
39		00	03	84					

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
चिक्कम्मनहल्ली	49/3	00	24	99	बिदरे कावलु	217	00	01	15
(जारी)	46/1	00	01	05	(जारी)	218	00	48	51
	50	00	06	71		219	00	00	56
	45/1	00	24	37		224	00	54	19
	44/1	00	33	17		223	00	24	95
	44/2	00	00	26		225	00	44	13
	43	00	18	36		230	00	40	53
(8) मुत्तली	120	01	61	04		231	00	21	18
	121	01	33	53		236	00	40	50
	122	00	86	83		237	00	42	82
(9) श्रीगाराहल्ली	48	00	99	69		244	00	29	01
(10) सोमनहल्ली	296	06	06	79		243	00	13	37
कावलु						242	00	42	06
	सर्वे नं. 296 में	00	11	68		143	00	20	69
	3 रोड					144	00	18	28
	286	00	36	53		142	00	00	10
	277	00	16	71		141	00	41	83
तालुक : अरसीकरे	जिला : हासन	राज्य : कर्नाटक				138	00	40	59
(1) कंकरे	231/2बी	00	00	11		139	00	02	48
	231/2सी	00	23	10		135	00	02	31
	231/2डी	00	30	74		134	00	38	64
	231/2ई	00	00	19		331	00	67	23
	231/ए	00	33	19		133	00	38	80
	232/1	00	93	53		132	00	41	02
	236/8	00	18	72		131	00	32	71
	236/7	00	25	23		126	00	10	70
	236	00	59	16		130	00	02	70
	236/6	00	30	42		127	00	32	91
	244	00	64	77		128	00	44	43
	246/8	00	09	88		287	00	42	19
	246/7	00	09	74		288	00	43	24
	246	00	07	27		289	00	00	52
	246/5	00	20	90		4	00	63	36
	246/4	00	07	89		304	00	42	12
	246/1	00	20	90		88	00	40	29
	246/2	00	00	10		89	00	40	84
	252	00	34	44		86	00	00	13
(2) बिदरे कावलु	213	00	51	77		84	00	29	35
	212	00	03	08		85	00	09	35
	214	00	08	42		75	00	14	42
	1	00	47	41		74	00	27	87
						72	00	00	58
						63	00	42	63

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
विदरे कावलु	313	00	40	59	कॉडेनहालु	150/1	00	25	25
(जारी)	सर्वे नं. 313 और	01	03	79	(जारी)	152/1	00	10	71
	गाँव सीमा के बीच					152/2	00	00	11
	में भूमि					153/4	00	15	59
(3) मंगलापुरा	6	00	67	90		154	00	11	29
	5	00	17	73		155/1	00	06	25
	4	00	01	41		155/2एफ	00	09	77
	सर्वे नं. 5 और	00	12	26		155/2सी	00	08	70
	39 के बीच में					158/3	00	15	16
	रोड					158/4	00	14	54
	38	00	00	27		157	00	31	11
	39	00	65	89		24/2	00	17	76
	40	00	17	63		24/3	00	01	17
	31	00	30	85		23/3	00	16	23
	30	00	00	45		23/2	00	13	25
	29	00	41	98		23/1	00	35	88
	28	00	28	93		सर्वे नं. 23 और	00	04	84
(4) कॉडेनहालु	63	00	72	81		29 के बीच में			
	सर्वे नं. 63 और	00	03	11		नाला			
	80 के बीच में					22/4	00	00	02
	रोड					22/1	00	02	38
	80	00	72	93		29	00	64	96
	81	01	02	72		31	00	25	77
	139	00	19	56		30	00	33	61
	138	00	20	65		34	01	18	30
	83/4	00	22	40	(5) होन्नेनहल्ली	21	01	07	32
	सर्वे नं. 83 और	00	02	41		24	01	31	68
	123 के बीच में					16	00	65	04
	नाला					26	01	25	17
	137	00	00	22		40	00	03	35
	123/2	00	03	03		39	00	51	38
	125/2	00	10	92		41	00	29	91
	125/1	00	04	83		42	00	44	01
	127	00	25	32		11	00	00	16
	सर्वे नं. 127 में	00	08	11		10	00	07	17
	नाला					44	00	63	11
	130	00	12	86		5	00	74	14
	129	00	13	47		4	00	10	26
	128/1	00	00	98	(6) होन्नेकुमारन-	21	00	24	61
	128/2	00	12	99	हल्ली	22	00	08	03
	151	00	02	60		20/4	00	20	05
	सर्वे नं. 151 और	00	04	10					
	150 के बीच में								
	रोड								

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
होनकुमारन-	20/3	00	03	60	(8) चेन्नापुरा	32/5	00	00	10
हल्ली (जारी)	31/3	00	00	10		32/6	00	28	52
	24/1	00	23	49		32/4	00	03	37
	24/2	00	02	56		35/3	00	01	11
	31/2	00	23	92		35/1	00	11	07
	30	00	51	66		36/6	00	10	95
सर्वे नं. 30 और		00	09	90		36/5	00	11	84
37 के बीच में						36/4	00	08	65
रोड						36/3	00	03	19
37		00	35	93		36/8	00	08	48
41		00	02	27		36/1	00	09	42
39/1		00	12	98		37	00	07	19
38		00	09	60		39	00	26	90
39/4		00	00	55		40/6	00	07	26
39/3		00	04	06		40/4	00	53	25
39/2		00	09	86		40/2	00	01	51
सर्वे नं. 39 और		00	03	85		40/1ए	00	07	05
55 के बीच में						41/2	00	06	83
रोड						41/1	00	15	57
56		00	19	33		42/1	00	05	21
55/1		00	06	85		43/1	00	00	32
55/2		00	09	04		42/2ए	00	13	31
53/26		00	03	03		43/3	00	10	40
53/27		00	04	42		44/1	00	01	86
53/2		00	04	25		44/2	00	22	43
53/3		00	01	94		45/1	00	62	60
52		00	19	51		45/2	00	15	86
50		00	39	73		47	00	38	39
(7) जेक्कनहल्ली	40/2	00	16	08		48/1	00	24	87
	40	00	28	73		50	01	81	23
	39/1	00	06	45	(9) नागरहल्ली	21/2	00	03	16
	110/2	00	26	32		21/4	00	00	44
	110/1	00	19	69		18/बी	00	27	39
	50/2	00	09	75		18/1ए	00	01	29
	50/7	00	09	26		18/2	00	04	82
	50/1	00	09	72		18	00	32	61
	49	00	62	28		16/4	00	22	58
	48/5	00	15	97		16/3	00	05	05
	48/4	00	02	15		16/10	00	07	82
	48/3	00	04	30		16/2बी	00	11	78
	112	00	00	36		16/2ए	00	29	33
	111	00	24	49					
	46	00	56	76					

1	2	3	4	5
नागरहल्ली	16/1	00	18	05
(जारी)	7/5	00	03	36
(10) बमचिहल्ली	सर्वे नं. 33 और गाँव सीमा के बीच में नाला	00	00	69
	33/3	00	30	02
	सर्वे नं. 33 और 32 के बीच में नाला	00	03	28
	32	00	32	93
(11) चीनकंहल्ली	43	00	23	53
	44	00	19	44
	45/2	00	01	90
तालुक : चेन्नरायपटना	जिला : हासन	राज्य : कर्नाटक		
(1) कंडिहल्ली	97	00	05	97
	96	00	83	52
	63	00	29	14
	64	00	54	98
	61	00	65	82
	60	00	52	43
	59	00	09	60

[फा. सं. एल-14014/81/2010-जी पी]

के. के. शर्मा, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 21st February, 2011

S.O. 731.—Whereas it appears to Government of India that it is necessary in public interest that for transportation of natural gas from terminal point of Vijayawada-Nellore-Chennai pipeline near Tiruttani in Tamil Nadu to consumers in various parts of the country, Chennai-Bangalore-Mangalore pipeline should be laid by M/s. Relogistics Infrastructure Limited;

And, whereas, it appears to Government of India that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the Right of User in land under which the said pipeline is proposed to be laid and which are described in the Schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), Government of India hereby declares its intention to acquire the Right of User therein;

Any person interested in the land described in the said Schedule may, within twenty-one days from the date on which the copies of the notification as published in the Gazette of India under sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the

said Act, are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of the Right of User therein for laying the pipeline under the land to Shri K. Mallinath, Competent Authority, Relogistics Infrastructure Limited #74, 2nd Floor, Prestige Feroze, Cunningham Road, Bangalore-560052, Karnataka State.

SCHEDULE

Taluk : Tumkur District : Tumkur State : Karnataka

Name of Village	Survey No.	Area to be acquired for Sub-Division	Hectare	Are C-Are
-----------------	------------	--------------------------------------	---------	-----------

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
(1) Nandihalli	40	00	02	72
	87	00	00	19
	86	00	47	90
	41	00	33	01
	101	00	44	05
	42	03	24	52

Taluka : Hasan District : Hasan State : Karnataka

(1) Siddapura	21	00	59	79
	19/3	00	30	47
	19/5	00	10	09
	Nala in between sy. no 17 & 20	00	05	47
	20/1	00	22	36
	20/2	00	00	10
	17/2	00	25	63
	17/1	00	71	26
	16/8	00	00	00
	16/9	00	14	55
	16/10	00	09	77
	16/5	00	00	15
	16/6	00	10	17
	6/1	00	14	50
	6/2	00	19	53
	Road in between sy. no 6 & 7	00	04	85
	Railway track in between sy. no. 6 & 7	00	06	42
	7/1	00	12	63
	7/2	00	09	14
	8/1	00	13	69
	99	00	11	34

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Siddapura (Contd.)	Road between sy. no 99 & 91	00	08	95	Chigatihalli (Contd.)	5/3	00	06	49
	90/4	00	00	10		6	00	07	77
	91/1	00	87	82		7/2	00	13	89
	92	00	00	10		7/1	00	13	11
	88/2	00	31	15		8	00	14	99
	93/2	00	03	67		9	00	39	15
	93/1	00	01	96		10	00	01	95
	84	00	82	20		Land between sy. no. 10 & 56	00	09	99
(2) Karebare	1	00	26	87		56/1	00	00	21
Kavalu	2	00	21	20		56/2	00	01	69
	247	00	29	18		56/3	00	17	96
	246	00	03	98		56/4	00	18	01
	248	00	11	63		56/5	00	11	42
	Nala in between Sy. No. 248 & 238	00	05	72		57/1	00	01	77
	238	00	49	27		Land between sy.no 57 & 47	00	12	50
	239	00	01	47		47/2	00	22	89
	237	00	03	37		47/1	00	03	11
	240	00	02	51		42/1	00	13	67
	48	00	73	48		42/2	00	14	40
	49	00	00	33		42/3	00	10	15
	Nala in between Sy. No. 48 & 50	00	02	02		41/3	00	27	37
	47	00	19	56		41/4	00	10	21
	50	00	35	07		41/5	00	02	20
	51	00	50	81		40	00	17	76
	52	00	50	64	(5) Honnavara	39	00	03	84
	53	00	49	97		99/1	00	02	58
	54	00	45	38		99/2	00	14	28
	55	00	10	80		101	00	15	21
(3) Hullenahalli	49	00	00	10		100/1	00	00	51
(4) Chigatihalli	21	00	00	10		100/2	00	06	54
	24	01	09	82		100/3	00	08	61
	23	00	16	86		100/4	00	00	50
	22/5	00	22	29		132	00	09	32
	22/4	00	10	64		131	00	09	97
	22/6	00	06	11		129	00	06	79
	22/7	00	10	16		130	00	19	79
	4/1	00	10	34		128	00	05	30
	5/1	00	09	28		127/1	00	08	37
	5/2	00	08	49		127/2	00	05	57
						Road in between sy. no 127 & 200	00	04	57

	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
Honnagara	200		00	00	97	Poomagame	20/3		00	14	92
(Contd.)	201		00	11	12	(Contd.)	19/2		00	22	16
	202		00	05	94		18/5		00	07	38
	203		00	14	12		18/3		00	02	34
	204		00	04	01		14		00	16	14
	295		00	04	27		Land in between		00	10	60
	206		00	06	27		Sy. No. 14 & 247				
	208		00	19	46		247		00	01	84
	209		00	07	59		13		00	13	47
	210		00	04	32		12		00	02	06
	211		00	04	08		9		00	10	21
	212		00	04	54		8		00	07	79
	213		00	04	35		6/10		00	17	55
	214		00	06	76		257		00	00	10
	215		00	01	04		6/9		00	01	22
	Road between		00	04	07		258		00	11	41
	Sy. No. 215 & 261						6/5		00	03	84
	261/1		00	00	54		6/2		00	01	84
	261/2		00	01	96		6/4		00	15	56
	260		00	07	33		6/3		00	02	75
	259/1		00	11	37		Pond in the		00	21	86
	259/2		00	18	58		Sy. No. 266				
	273		00	18	00		267		00	34	16
	257		00	19	89		Nala between		00	10	35
	256/1		00	00	23		Sy.No. 267 & 110				
	274/1		00	13	54		110		00	07	67
	274/2		00	01	91		109		00	13	71
	Nala between		00	03	04		Road between		00	04	98
	Sy. No. 274 &						Sy.No. 109 & 96				
	276						96/2		00	10	90
	276		00	32	51		96/1		00	24	92
	275/5		00	00	10		97/1		00	09	78
	275/6		00	16	56		97/2		00	12	61
	275/1		00	03	87		98		00	18	69
	275/2		00	12	54		99/3		00	12	77
	275/3		00	10	37		99/1		00	12	55
	133/3		00	01	10		100/1		00	03	87
(6) Poomagame	22		00	01	14		102/10		00	13	54
	Road between		00	02	84		102/9		00	07	18
	Sy. No 22 & 21						102/8		00	02	31
	20/2		00	02	22		102/1		00	00	10
	21		00	09	31		102/2		00	04	13
	20/4		00	13	59		102/3		00	07	87

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Poomagame	102/4	00	03	29	Kenkere	231/A	00	33	19
(Contd.)	102/5	00	01	02	(Contd.)	232/1	00	93	53
	102/6	00	01	16		236/8	00	18	72
	103	00	24	90		236/7	00	25	23
(7) Chikkamma-	29/1	00	22	23		236	00	59	16
nahalli	29/2A	00	42	25		236/6	00	30	42
	30	00	00	18		244	00	64	77
	31/2	00	27	28		246/8	00	09	88
	31/3	00	00	21		246/7	00	09	74
	31/4	00	09	03		246	00	07	27
	34	00	25	79		246/5	00	20	90
	35/1	00	13	56		246/4	00	07	89
	35/2	00	11	11		246/1	00	20	90
	35/4	00	01	06		246/2	00	00	10
	37	00	39	97		252	00	34	44
	38	00	46	73	(2) Bidare	213	00	51	77
	48/1	00	48	25	Kavalu				
	49/1	00	00	28		212	00	03	08
	48/2	00	01	82		214	00	08	42
	49/3	00	24	99		1	00	47	41
	46/1	00	01	05		217	00	01	15
	50	00	06	71		218	00	48	51
	45/1	00	24	37		219	00	00	56
	44/1	00	33	17		224	00	54	19
	44/2	00	00	26		223	00	24	95
	43	00	18	36		225	00	44	13
(8) Muthathi	120	01	61	04		230	00	40	53
	121	01	33	53		231	00	21	18
	122	00	86	83		236	00	40	50
(9) Bogarahalli	48	00	99	69		237	00	42	82
(10) Somanahalli	296	06	06	79		244	00	29	01
Kavalu						243	00	13	37
	3 Roads in the	00	11	68		242	00	42	06
	Sy. No. 296					143	00	20	69
	286	00	36	53		144	00	18	28
	277	00	16	71		142	00	00	10
						141	00	41	83
Taluk: Arsikere	District: Hassan	State: Karnataka				138	00	40	59
(1) Kenkere	231/2B	00	00	11		139	00	02	48
	231/2C	00	23	10		135	00	02	31
	231/2D	00	30	74		134	00	38	64
	231/2E	00	00	19		331	00	67	23

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Bidare	133	00	38	80	Kondenahalu	Nala in the	00	08	11
Kavalu	132	00	41	02	(Contd.)	Sy. No. 127			
(Contd.)	131	00	32	71		130	00	12	86
	126	00	10	70		129	00	13	47
	130	00	02	70		128/1	00	00	98
	127	00	32	91		128/2	00	12	99
	128	00	44	43		151	00	02	60
	287	00	42	19		Road in between	00	04	10
	288	00	43	24		Sy. No. 151 & 150			
	289	00	00	52		150/1	00	25	25
	4	00	63	36		152/1	00	10	71
	304	00	42	12		152/2	00	00	11
	88	00	40	29		153/4	00	15	59
	89	00	40	84		154	00	11	29
	86	00	00	13		155/1	00	06	35
	84	00	29	35		155/2F	00	09	77
	85	00	09	35		155/2C	00	08	70
	75	00	14	42		158/3	00	15	16
	74	00	27	87		158/4	00	14	54
	72	00	00	58		157	00	31	11
	63	00	42	63		24/2	00	17	76
	313	00	40	59		24/3	00	01	17
	Land in between	01	03	79		23/3	00	16	23
	Sy. No. 313 & V.B.					23/2	00	13	25
(3) Mangalapura	6	00	67	90		23/1	00	35	88
	5	00	17	73		Nala in between	00	04	84
	4	00	01	41		Sy. No. 23 & 29			
	Road in between	00	12	26		22/4	00	00	02
	Sy. No. 5 & 39					22/1	00	02	38
	38	00	00	27		29	00	64	96
	39	00	65	89		31	00	25	77
	40	00	17	63		30	00	33	61
	31	00	30	85		34	01	18	30
	30	00	00	45	(5) Honnenahalli	21	01	07	32
	29	00	41	98		24	01	31	68
	28	00	28	93		16	00	65	04
4) Kondenahalu	63	00	72	81		26	01	25	17
	Road in between	00	03	11		40	00	03	35
	Sy. No. 63 & 80					39	00	51	38
	80	00	72	93		41	00	29	91
	81	01	02	72		42	00	44	01
	139	00	19	56		11	00	00	16
	138	00	20	65		10	00	07	17
	83/4	00	22	40		44	00	63	11
	Nala in between	00	02	41		5	00	74	14
	Sy. No. 83 & 123					4	00	10	26
	137	00	00	22	(6) Honnakuma-	21	00	24	61
	123/2	00	03	03	ranahalli				
	125/2	00	10	92		22	00	08	03
	125/1	00	04	83		20/4	00	20	05
	127	00	25	32		20/3	00	03	60

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Honnakuma-	31/3	00	00	10	Chennapura	37	00	07	19
ranahalli	24/1	00	23	49	(Contd.)	39	00	26	90
(Contd.)	24/2	00	02	56		40/6	00	07	26
	31/2	00	23	92		40/4	00	53	25
	30	00	51	66		40/2	00	01	51
Road in between		00	09	90		40/1A	00	07	05
Sy. No. 30 & 37						41/2	00	06	83
37		00	35	93		41/1	00	15	57
41		00	02	27		42/1	00	05	21
39/1		00	12	98		43/1	00	00	32
38		00	09	60		42/2A	00	13	31
39/4		00	00	55		43/3	00	10	40
39/3		00	04	06		44/1	00	01	86
39/2		00	09	86		44/2	00	22	43
Road in between		00	03	85		45/1	00	62	60
Sy. No. 39 & 55						45/2	00	15	86
56		00	19	33		47	00	38	39
55/1		00	06	85		48/1	00	24	87
55/2		00	09	04	(9) Nagarahalli	50	01	81	23
53/26		00	03	03		21/2	00	03	16
53/27		00	04	42		21/4	00	00	44
53/2		00	04	25		18/1B	00	27	39
53/3		00	01	94		18/1A	00	01	29
52		00	19	51		18/2	00	04	82
50		00	39	73		18	00	32	61
(7) Jekkanahalli	40/2	00	16	08		16/4	00	22	58
40		00	28	73		16/3	00	05	05
39/1		00	06	45		16/10	00	07	82
110/2		00	26	32		16/2B	00	11	78
110/1		00	19	69		16/2A	00	29	33
50/2		00	09	75		16/1	00	18	05
50/7		00	09	26	(10) Bamachihalli	7/5	00	03	36
50/1		00	09	72		Nala in between	00	00	69
49		00	62	28		Sy. No 33 & V.B			
48/5		00	15	97		33/3	00	30	02
48/4		00	02	15		Nala in between	00	03	28
48/3		00	04	30		Sy. No 33 & 32			
112		00	00	26		32	00	32	93
111		00	24	49	(11) Jeenakere-	43	00	23	53
46		00	56	76	halli				
(8) Chennapura	32/5	00	00	10		44	00	19	44
	32/6	00	28	52		45/2	00	01	90
	32/4	00	03	37	Taluk: Chennarayapatna				
	35/3	00	01	11	District: Hassan				
	35/1	00	11	07	State: Karnataka				
	36/6	00	10	95	(1) Kodihalli	97	00	05	97
	36/5	00	11	84		96	00	83	52
	36/4	00	08	65		63	00	29	14
	36/3	00	03	19		64	00	54	98
	36/8	00	08	48		61	00	65	82
	36/1	00	09	42		60	00	52	43
						59	00	09	60

श्रम एवं रोजगार मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 11 फरवरी, 2011

का.आ. 732.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार बी.सी.सी.एल. के भोवरा कोक प्लांट के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण नं. 1, धनबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 16/2003) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 11-2-2011 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-20012/33/2002-आई आर(सी-1)]

डी.एस.एस. श्रीनिवास राव, डेस्क अधिकारी

MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT

New Delhi, the 11th February, 2011

S.O. 732.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 16/2003) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No. 1, Dhanbad, as shown in the Annexure, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. BCCL, and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 11-2-2011.

[No. L-20012/33/2002-IR (C-I)]

D.S.S. SRINIVASA RAO, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL No. 1, DHANBAD**

In the matter of a reference U/s. 10(1)(d)(2A) of ID Act.

Reference No. 16 of 2003

Parties : Employers in relation to the management of Bhowra Coke Plant of M/s. BCCL.

AND

Their Workman.

Present : Shri H. M. Singh, Presiding Officer

APPEARANCES:

For the Employers : Shri U. N. Lal, Advocate.

For the Workman : Shri Raghunandan Rai, Representative.

State : Jharkhand.

Industry : Coal

Dated, the 31-01-2011

AWARD

By Order No. L-20012/33/2002-IR(C-I) dated 24-1-03 the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour

has, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal :

"Whether the management of BCCL, Bhowra Coke Plant is justified in not giving the benefit of VRS(F) to Smt. Pan Muni Mahjhan? If not to what relief is the workman entitled?"

2. The case of the sponsoring union is that Smt. Pan Muni Mahjhan has been working as (General Mazdoor) Kamin w.e.f. 18-10-1973 under the management of Bhowra Coke Plant. Voluntary Retirement Scheme was adopted by M/s. BCCL, for those female employees whose age was below 55 years as on 5-6-2001 as per office Order No. BCCL/GM/P&IR/ES/2001/11543-643 Smt. Pan Muni Mahjhan had submitted an application before Chief Engineer (Chemical), Bhowra Coke Plant on 20-5-2001 for employment of her son, Sri Paresh Manjhi under V.R.S. Scheme. On the basis of application of the workman. Personnel Officer, Bhowra Coke Plant had taken examination of Paresh Manjhi on 6-7-2001 as per letter No. 2001/PER/130 dated 4-7-2001, The Chief Engineer (Chemical), Bhowra Coke Plant, rejected the application of Smt. Pan Muni Mahjhan vide letter No. 2001/210 dated 15-9-2001 stating that her age is 55 years, which is not correct, VRS Scheme was notified by the Company in the year 1998. At that time an application was submitted by Smt. Pan Muni Mahjhan which was not considered by the management. Then an industrial dispute was raised by the union before the A.L.C.(C), Dhanbad, which was ended in failure. Thereafter the Ministry of Labour, New Delhi, intimated vide their letter No. L-20012/417/99-(C-I) dated 24-1-2000 that V.R.S. is in force till now and company will consider her demand after submission of application in proper form. As per direction of the Ministry an application was filed before the Chief Engineer (Chemical), Bhowra Coke Plant but her application was rejected on 16-5-2000.

In view of above facts and circumstances it has been prayed that Hon'ble Tribunal be pleased to pass an award in favour of the workman.

Written statement has been filed on behalf of the workman stating that the female employee concerned had submitted her resignation under Spl. VRS (F) on 20-6-2001 in respect to the Spl. VRS (Female) Circular circulated vide No. BCCL/GM/P&IR/ES/2001/11543-643 dated 5-6-2001. The case was sent through Western Jharia Area to the Headquarter and the request was not acceded to as by that time the female employee had crossed the age limit of 55 years. As such the female employee was intimated about her case and the request was not acceded to as per letter No. BCCL/PA-II/Spl. VRS(F)/EJA/01/18821 dated 29/30-3-2001. Smt. Pan Muni Mahjhan, P. No. 00954081 is

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
10. Kusun Nagar	2169	00	02	90	Kusun Nagar	1728	00	00	10
	2167	00	06	49	—Contd.	1722	00	00	10
	2166	00	00	34		1724	00	05	74
	2146	00	10	95		1723	00	01	79
	2148	00	02	70		1557	00	04	44
	2142	00	00	98		2847	00	05	78
	2147	00	07	59		1558	00	11	09
	2149	00	00	30		1544	00	07	49
	2141	00	04	34		1561	00	07	84
	1825	00	02	85		1560	00	00	10
	1826	00	05	73		1541	00	00	10
	2139	00	01	80		1540	00	07	99
	1827	00	01	70		1536	00	04	80
	1829	00	02	64		1535	00	00	10
	1828	00	01	59		1537	00	20	87
	1831	00	00	65		1539	00	00	48
	1830	00	04	15		1538	00	07	34
	1812	00	01	07		1520	00	00	87
	1811	00	03	86		1521	00	20	40
	1809	00	01	68		1514	00	06	58
	1810	00	02	50		1513	00	06	50
	1805	00	00	17		1510	00	06	68
	1804	00	04	96		1498	00	07	76
	1801	00	01	48		1497	00	06	15
	1802	00	07	56		1496	00	07	06
	1803	00	04	02		1487	00	02	16
	1757	00	19	13		1488	00	04	23
	2905	00	04	90		1489	00	06	07
	2814	00	13	13		1477	00	05	43
	2813	00	03	17		1476	00	07	43
	1758	00	07	75		1473	00	00	43
	1759	00	02	21		1475	00	07	13
	1763	00	21	08		1474	00	02	53
	1765	00	00	39		1469	00	03	14
	1766	00	07	78		1467	00	03	91
	1767	00	11	54		1468	00	05	66
	1770	00	00	09		1466	00	01	07
	1768	00	01	07		2775	00	01	06
	1769	00	09	62		1463	00	02	45
	1726	00	03	14		1462	00	03	43
	1725	00	08	10		1464	00	00	92
	1727	00	00	41		1461	00	03	72

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Kusun Nagar	1460	00	00	37
(Contd.)	1459	00	00	10
	1453	00	08	17
	1452	00	00	66
	1454	00	02	49
	1270	00	07	50
	1269	00	06	08
	1271	00	08	50
	1253	00	03	41
	1252	00	26	43
	1251	00	05	05
	1250	00	09	45
	1249	00	04	55
	1247	00	01	54
	1248	00	04	47
	1245	00	09	65
	1215	00	04	06
	1214	00	09	62
	1212	00	09	36
	1202	00	17	31
	1200	00	11	34
	999	00	20	58
	998	00	06	99
	997	00	22	84
	996	00	03	97
	995	00	19	41
	2898	00	06	04
	839	00	02	50
	838	00	06	10
	840	00	03	71
	837	00	10	11
	789	00	11	16
	793	00	04	53
	788	00	04	42
	794	00	06	21
	795	00	09	52
	786	00	03	46
	785	00	02	57
	784	00	04	48
	801	00	05	82
	783	00	02	31
	733	00	08	67

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Kusun Nagar	732	00	08	24
(Contd.)	729	00	06	84
	727	00	01	30
	728	00	05	59
	710	00	07	04
	711	00	03	83
	706	00	09	36
	705	00	02	32
	700	00	15	72
	704	00	02	98
	693	00	08	50
	694	00	00	10
	677	00	00	54
	678	00	00	25
	679	00	00	10
	691	00	13	89
	681	00	00	20
	682	00	03	75
	683	00	09	10
	687	00	04	49
	686	00	01	61
	684	00	00	80
	685	00	08	11
	388	00	19	25
	387	00	18	65
	386	00	02	04
	120	00	05	50
	121	00	05	93
	21	00	05	57
	20	00	00	10
	22	00	08	16
	23	00	00	75
	24	00	01	40
	25	00	00	10
	26	00	00	10
	18	00	00	15
	17	00	03	66
	16	00	16	83
	1	00	03	14
	2	00	03	50

[F.No. L-14014/12/2011-GP]

K. K. SHARMA, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE DR. R. K. YADAV, PRESIDING OFFICER,
CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL No. 1,
KARKARDOOMA COURTS COMPLEX, DELHI**

I.D. NO.13/2010

M/s Aeroflot Russian Airlines,
Ground Floor, 15-17, Tolstoy House,
Tolstoy Marg, New Delhi -110001.

... Applicant/Management

Versus

Shri Sunil Kumar Rathi
S/o Sh. Mukhtiar Singh,
R/o Vill. Goyala Khurd,
Nazafgarh, Pole No. 19,
New Delhi -110071.

... Respondent/workman

AWARD

Ground handling services were undertaken by Aeroflot Russian International Airlines, (hereinafter referred to as the Airlines) at I.G.I. Airport, New Delhi. The Airlines has employed a handful of employees for that purpose. Vide circular dated 28th of September, 2007, Director General, Civil Aviation, took a decision to enlist agencies which can undertake ground handling services on various aerodroms. In anticipation of that decision, a press release was made by the Press Information Bureau, Government of India, New Delhi on 1st of February, 2007, informing that approval has been granted by Ministry of Civil Aviation regarding ground handling policy at Metropolitan Airports, including I.G.I. Airport, New Delhi. It was detailed in the Press Release that ground handling services at Metropolitan Airports would be carried out by respective Airport Operators itself by its joint venture and the Airlines, involved in ground handling will not be permitted to undertake self handling w.e.f. 1st of January, 2009. On the date of the press release, the Airlines was doing self handling at IGI Airport, New Delhi. The Press Release made employees of the Airlines panicky about their future. They started approaching other agencies for employment and informed the Airlines that they would take employment elsewhere. 22 employees including operators of the Airlines tendered their resignation in August, 2007. Since ramp ground handling service require high level of cooperation and team work in a fixed time frame hence ramp ground handling services cannot be engaged in peace-meal and on account of resignation of its employees the Airlines took a decision to request Combata Civil Aviation Pvt. Ltd. to provide complete ramp ground handling service to them.

2. Aeroflot Employees Union (hereinafter referred to as the Union raised an industrial dispute against the

Airlines through demand letter dated 2nd of May, 2005. Since the Airlines failed to consider their demands, the Union was left with no option but to initiate conciliation proceedings by way of filing a claim statement before the Conciliation Officer. When conciliation proceedings failed, a failure report was submitted by the Conciliation Officer to the appropriate Government. On consideration of that failure report, the appropriate Government had referred a dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication, vide order No. L-11012/11/2006-IR(CM-I), New Delhi dated 1st of June, 2006 wherein issues relating to demand of proper pay scales and other facilities under well defined service conditions applicable to the employees of the Airlines, doing ground handling jobs, were sent for adjudication.

3. During the pendency of the said dispute for adjudication, Rishi Pal, Suresh Kumar, Sunil Kumar Rathi and Jagpal were served with charge sheet, wherein allegations were levelled that on 28-3-07, it was reported by them to a new channel that there was a great security threat at I.G.I. Airport, New Delhi due to actions of the Airlines, besides allegations that the aforesaid employees, who were working from last 12 years, claimed that they were not aware for whom they were working despite the fact that they were employees of the Airlines. Replies, submitted by the aforesaid employees to the charge sheets referred above, were found to be not satisfactory. The Airlines took a decision to hold a domestic enquiry in the charges levelled against the aforesaid employees and appointed an enquiry officer vide order dated 4-5-07. The Enquiry Officer conducted an enquiry ex-parte, when charge sheeted employees opted not to participate in the enquiry. He submitted his report dated 1-8-07 to the Airlines. Show cause notice dated 4-8-07 against the proposed punishment of dismissal from service was served on charge sheeted employees. Explanation offered by the charge sheeted employees were found to be not satisfactory. Charge sheeted employees were dismissed from service vide order dated 14-8-07. The Airlines preferred approval applications, as contemplated by clause (b) of sub section (2) of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (in short the Act) and paid an amount of Rs. 7500 each to them, being equal to one month's salary, by money orders dated 14-8-2007, in lieu of one month's notice. A prayer was made to this Tribunal to accord approval to the action of Airlines in dismissing the services of the charge sheeted employees.

4. In reply to the approval applications it was projected that Shri Suresh Kumar was the President, Rishi Pal was General Secretary, Jagpal was Secretary and Sunil Kumar Rathi was ordinary member of the Union. The Union sought status of protected workman for them, by moving appropriate applications as well as seeking declaration from A.L.C. in that regard. It was agitated that when Airlines failed to respond to their applications within 15 days time frame, it was assumed that the aforesaid

employees were granted status of protected workman. A claim was made that the Airlines cannot terminate services of protected workman, save with express permission in writing of the Tribunal before whom dispute, relating to proper pay scales and other facilities under well defined service conditions, was pending adjudication. The Union projected that the approval applications, moved by the Airlines are irrelevant, since an industrial dispute pends adjudication. A claim was made that the approval applications may be dismissed.

5. When report of the Enquiry Officer was under consideration, the Union moved an application before this Tribunal on 16-7-2007, seeking directions to restrain the Airlines from changing service conditions of members of the Union, besides seeking status of protected employees in terms of Sub-section (4) of Section 33 of the Act read with Rule 61 of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957 (in short the Rules). The said application was disposed of by this Tribunal vide order dated 13-8-2007, commanding the Airlines to comply the provisions of Section 33 of the Act, in case it opts to discharge or dismiss the charge sheeted employees.

6. The Airlines dismissed the employees referred above, which issue was raised by them before Conciliation Officer by way of filing a claim statement. Conciliation proceedings resulted into a failure. Conciliation Officer submitted his report to the appropriate Government, as contemplated by sub-section (4) of Section 12 of the Act. On consideration of the said failure report, the appropriate Government referred the dispute to this Tribunal, vide order No. L-11 0012/4/2008-IR(CM I), New Delhi dated 14th of August, 2008 with following terms:

"Whether the action of the management of Russian International Airlines, New Delhi, in dismissing the services of S/Shri Suresh Kumar, Jagpal, Sunil Kumar Rathi and Rishi Pal is justified and legal?"

2. To what relief are the concerned workmen entitled?"

7. Claim statement was filed, in response to the above reference, by the Union pleading that despite orders passed by this Tribunal, the Airlines terminated services of two office bearers and one ordinary members of the Union, who were protected employees. It went on to detail that the Union sought status of protected workman from the Airlines vide its letter dated 13th of December, 2006, which communication was not responded to. Though there was an obligation on the Airlines to reply the said communication within a period of 15 days, as contemplated by sub-rule (2) of Rule 61 of the Rules, yet the Airlines opted to maintain an eerie silence. The Union moved Assistant Labour Commissioner for seeking a declaration of protected workman. Since the aforesaid employees were protected workmen, the Airlines was under an obligation

to obtain prior permission of this Tribunal to terminate their services. Since their case was covered by Sub-section (3) of Section 33 of the Act, the approval applications moved by the Airlines are irrelevant. The Airlines acted in utter disregard to the order dated 13-8-2007 passed by the Tribunal. It was projected that this Tribunal may not approve the illegal action taken by the Airlines, dismissing the aforesaid employees from their services and to reinstate them in service with continuity, full back wages, and consequential benefits.

8. In reply to the approval applications it was projected that Shri Suresh Kumar was the President, Shri Rishi Pal was General Secretary, Jagpal was Secretary and Sunil Kumar Rathi was the ordinary members of the Union. The Union sought status of protected workman for them by moving appropriate applications as well as seeking declaration from Assistant Labour Commissioner in that regard. It was agitated that when the Airlines failed to reply their application within 15 days time framed, it was presumed that the aforesaid employees, were granted status of protected workman. The Airlines cannot terminate services of protected workman, save with express permission in writing of the Tribunal, before whom dispute relating to the issue raised by the Union for proper pay scales and other facilities under well defined service conditions was pending adjudication. Approval applications are irrelevant, claims the Union.

9. The Airlines demurred the claim that the employees referred above had committed serious acts of misconduct, hence they were charge sheeted vide charge sheet dated 5th of April, 2007. Explanation submitted by them were found to be unsatisfactory, hence a decision was taken to hold domestic enquiry. Shri Jitesh Pandey, an independent and impartial person, was appointed as Enquiry Officer, vide letter dated 4-5-2007. Shri Pandey conducted the enquiry in accordance with the principles of natural justice and submitted his report dated 1st of August, 2007 to the Airlines. Since charges stood proved against the aforesaid employees, they were served with a show cause notice dated 4-8-2007, alongwith the copy of the enquiry report, calling them to submit their explanations as to why they should not be dismissed from service. Explanation submitted by them were considered and found to be unsatisfactory. The Airlines decided to dismiss their services. Accordingly their services were dismissed vide letter dated 14-8-2007. Since an industrial dispute was pending before this Tribunal, approval applications as contemplated by clause (b) of Sub-section (2) of Section 33 of the Act were moved and simultaneously one months salary was sent to them by money order. It has been disputed that the aforesaid employees were protected workmen. The Airlines claimed that letter dated 13-12-06 and its postal receipts were manipulated documents. No such letter was ever received by Airlines, hence there was no question of its reply. It has been projected that when

ramp ground handling services were given to Combata Civil Aviation Pvt. Ltd., the Airlines had to retrench 29 employees on 14th of September, 2007. Since the Airlines is not doing ramp ground handling services, claim of the Union for reinstatement of the services of the aforesaid employees had become infructuous. The Airlines projected that the provisions of clause (b) of Sub-section (2) of Section 33 of the Act are applicable to the controversy under reference, hence approval applications were moved. The dismissed employees were never declared as protected employees, hence claim of the Union that provisions of Sub-section (3) of Section 33 of the Act are attracted, is uncalled for. It has been agitated that the dispute referred by the Government may be dismissed and action of dismissal of the aforesaid employees may be approved.

10. On approval applications following issues were settled:

1. Whether the claimant was protected workman?
2. Whether action of the management in terminating the services of the workman is legal, fair and justified? If yes, whether approval needs to be granted to the management?
3. Relief.

11. Though no issue as to virus of the enquiry proceedings was settled in the approval application, yet the Tribunal thought it expedient to deal that proposition at thresh-hold. Parties called upon to adduce evidence on that proposition. To discharge onus resting on it, Airlines examined Shri Jitesh Pandey, the Enquiry Officer. The Union brought Shri Suresh Kumar in the witness box to rebut facts unfolded by Shri Pandey. No other witness was examined by either of the parties.

12. After hearing Shri M. K. Dwivedi, authorized representative for the Airlines, and Shri M.A. Niazi, authorized representative of the Union and on appreciation of evidence produced by the parties, issue relating to virus of the enquiry was adjudicated vide order dated 12-11-2010 and it was concluded that the enquiry conducted by the Airlines was neither just nor fair nor proper. It was commanded that order dated 14-8-07, on the strength of which charge sheeted employees were dismissed, cannot be given a favourable node.

13. When question relating to virus of enquiry proceedings has been answered against the management and an industrial dispute for adjudication of justifiability and legality of dismissal of the aforesaid employees pends articulation, a proposition arises as to whether approval applications have lost its efficacy. Hence parties were heard. Shri M.A. Niazi, authorised representative, raised his submissions on behalf of the Union. Shri M.K. Dwivedi authorised representative, presented his point of view on

behalf of the Airlines. I have given my careful consideration to the arguments advanced at the bar and perused the record. My findings on issues involved in the controversy are as follows.

14. In Bhagubhai Balubhai Patel, (1976 Lab.I.C. 4) the Apex Court ruled that the jurisdiction under Section 33 of the Act is confined only to see whether a prima facie case has been made out and the Authority "does not sit as a court of appeal, weighing or appreciating the evidence for itself but only examines the findings of the Enquiry Officer on the evidence in domestic enquiry as it is, in order to find out either whether there is a prima facie case or if the findings are perverse" for arriving at the finding that the charge has been proved, but stuck to the adjudication scrutiny of the domestic enquiry and the bonafides of the employer. Accordingly, it is open to the Authority under Section 33 of the Act to review the findings of fact arrived at in the domestic enquiry, the question of adequacy or sufficiency of the evidence, However, were not considered relevant in this limited jurisdiction, by the Apex Court in Lord Krishna Textiles Mills [1961(1) L.L.J.211]. The Apex Court detailed the scope of two fold approach to the problem by an Authority under Section 33 of the Act in granting or refusing permission in Bhagubhai Balubhai Patel (supra) in the following words:

"Firstly in a case where there is no defect in procedure in the course of a domestic enquiry into the charges for misconduct against an employee, the Tribunal can interfere with an order of dismissal on one or other of the following conditions :-

- (1) If there is no legal evidence at all recorded in the domestic enquiry against the concerned employee with reference to the charge or if no reasonable person can arrive at a conclusion of guilt on the charge levelled against the employee on the evidence recorded against him in the domestic enquiry. This is what is known as perverse finding.
- (2) Even if there is some legal evidence in the domestic enquiry but there is no prima facie case of guilt made out against the person charged for the offence even on the basis that the evidence so recorded is reliable. Such a case may overlap to some extent with the second part of the condition No.1 above. A prima facie case is not, as in a criminal case, a case proved to the hilt.

It must be made clear in following the above principles one or the other, as may be applicable in a particular case, the Tribunal does not sit as a court of appeal, weighing or reappreciating the evidence for itself but only examines the finding of the enquiry officer on

the evidence in the domestic enquiry as it is in order to find out either whether there is a prima facie case or if the findings are perverse.

Secondly, in the same case, i.e., where there is no failure of the principles of natural justice, in the course of domestic enquiry, if the Tribunal finds that dismissal of an employee is by way of victimisation or unfair labour practice, it will then have complete jurisdiction to interfere with the order of dismissal passed in the domestic enquiry. In that event the fact that there is no violation of the principles of natural justice in the course of the domestic enquiry will absolutely lose its importance or efficacy."

15. The enquiry contemplated by clause (b) of sub section (2) of Section 33 of the Act, with respect to the validity and legality of the domestic enquiry, is of very limited nature. The Tribunal can disregard the findings entered by the Enquiry Officer only if they are perverse. A finding can be said to be perverse in case not supported by legal evidence. If the finding is not perverse one and if there is a prima facie evidence to support the finding, the Authority under Section 33 of the Act cannot refuse to grant approval to the order passed by the management. Reference can be made to K. N. Mohanan [1993(II) L.L.J. 514]. The Apex Court in catena of precedents, in parallel to reference cases under Section 10 of the Act has ruled that even under Section 33, where employer had held no enquiry or the domestic enquiry held by him is found to be vitiated by the Tribunal, the right of the employer to justify action of discharge or dismissal taken by him' against the delinquent workman by adducing relevant evidence, for the first time before the Authority is well recognized. Reference can be made to the precedents in Bharat Sugar Mills Ltd. [(1961 (II) LLJ 644)], Ritz Theatre (Pvt.) Ltd. [1962 (II) LLJ 498], P. H. Kalyani [1963 (I) LLJ 679], Motipur Sugar Factory (Pvt.) Ltd. [1965 (II) LLJ 162] Jitendra Chandrakar [1971 (I) LLJ 543], Ganesh Dutt [1972 (I) LLJ 172], Firestone Tyre & Rubber Company of India (Pvt.) Ltd. [1973 (I) LLJ 278], Bhagubhai Balubhai Patel (supra), Britania Biscuit Company Ltd. [1977(1) LLJ 197] and K. M. Dev [1985 Lab.IC. 254]. Likewise right of the workman to lead evidence contra has been recognized. In such cases the entire matter is open before the Authority, which will have jurisdiction not only to go into the limited question of validity of the enquiry and the bonafides of the employer but also to satisfy itself, on facts before it, whether the action was justified. In other words, in such situation jurisdiction of the Authority is not confined to prima facie examination of the employer's action and the Authority can come to his own conclusion on consideration of evidence adduced before it. Reference can be made to the precedent in Motipur Sugar Factory Pvt. Ltd. (supra), Firestone Tyre and Rubber Company of India Ltd. (supra) and Radio and Electricals Manufacturing Company Ltd. [1978 (II) LLJ 131].

16. As detailed above, jurisdiction of this Tribunal under Section 33 of the Act has been made parallel to its

jurisdiction under Section 10 of the Act. What the Tribunal is required to adjudicate on this approval application, that very course is available to the parties when dispute referred above would be articulated. Two remedies are open to the workman viz. he may lodge a complaint under Section 33-A or seek prosecution of the Airlines under Section 31 (1) or may seek a reference under Section 10 and have its adjudication when he claims contravention of the provisions of Section 33 of the Act. Since approval application was moved, the only recourse adopted by the charge sheeted employees was under Section 10 of the Act and a dispute was referred by the appropriate Government to this Tribunal for adjudication. In case these applications are disposed of, pending adjudication of the reference, doctrine of prejudice cannot rob the Airlines of its right to prove misconduct of the charge sheeted employee and adjudication of the dispute referred by the appropriate Government. Pendency of these approval applications will only multiply the litigation.

16. The rights or defences, which are available to the Airlines in these approval applications, can be claimed by it in the adjudication of the reference. Therefore, it is thought expedient to dispose of these approval applications with a command that disposal of the approval applications by this award will be subject to the outcome of the dispute, referred by the appropriate Government to this Tribunal. Consequently, approval applications are disposed of with a command that the award passed herein would be subject to the findings that would be recorded on adjudication of the dispute referred by the appropriate Government. An award is, accordingly, passed. It be sent to the appropriate Government for publication.

Dated : 07-01-2011

Dr. R. K. YADAV, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 11 फरवरी, 2011

का.आ. 735.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार बी.सी.सी.एल. के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय नं. 2, धनबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 120/1995) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 10-12-2010 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-20012/346/1994-आई आर(सी-1)]

डी. एस. एस. श्रीनिवास राव, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 11th February, 2011

S.O. 735.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 120/1995) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No. 2, Dhanbad, as shown in the Annexure,

in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. BCCL, and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 10-12-2010.

[No. L-20012/346/1994-IR (C-I)]

D. S. S. SRINIVASA RAO, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL No. 2, AT DHANBAD

PRESENT : Shri Kishori Ram, Presiding Officer.

In the matter of an Industrial Dispute U/s. 10(1)(d) of I.D. Act, 1947

Reference No. 120 of 1995

PARTIES : Employers in relation to the management of Katras Area of M/s. BCCL and their workmen.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the Employers : Mr. H. Nath, Advocate.

On behalf of the Workman : Mr. B. B. Pandey, Advocate.

State : Jharkhand Industry : Coal

Dated, Dhanbad, the 17th January, 2011

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour, in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-20012/346/94-IR(Coal-I), dated, the 30th August, 1995.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the demand of the Union for reinstatement of Sri Basant Bhuian, Ex-Miner/Loader of Keshalpur Colliery w.e.f. 17-2-93 by the management of Keshalpur Under Katras Area of M/s. BCCL is justified ? If so, to what relief is the workman entitled ?"

The case of the workman Basant Bhuian, husband of Smt. Sabujwa Bhuini, Wagon Loader, Salanpur Colliery was appointed as Miner/Loader in place of his wife under V.R.S. (Voluntary Retirement Scheme) (Female). He was posted at Keshalpur Colliery as per letter No. KA/PD/VRS/323/5200 dated 3/4-6-87. He and his wife peacefully lived. He worked in Keshalpur Colliery for 6 years. But a charge-sheet No. KP/BCCL/Dy/CME/PD/CS/3461, dated 15-11-91 was issued against him that he got the said employment by fraudulent means, claiming to be the husband of Smt. Sabujwa Bhuini. On his show cause reply it was found unsatisfactory, in the result a domestic enquiry was held by Shri K. S. Singh, Personnel Manager, Katras Area as the Enquiry Officer. The workman participated in it, pleaded not guilty to the charge. He also produced his

legal document of marriage having been socially entered with Smt. Sabujwa Bhuini. She had also admitted her marriage with him, but she had complained to the management about her non-maintenance by him. After considering the aforesaid evidence, though the Enquiry Officer found him not guilty of the charges, yet the higher management disagreeing with his report ordered for a fresh enquiry.

3. Consequently, Shri M. C. Yadav as the Enquiry Officer again held an afresh enquiry. On examination of witnesses, he found the workman guilty of the charges and submitted his report, on the basis of which the workman was dismissed. Since there was no successful conciliation in the industrial dispute raised by the union of the workman, hence the industrial dispute came to this Tribunal for adjudication. Further it is pleaded that the case triggered of the complaint of Smt. Sabujwa Bhuini and Panku Bhuia, Dumper Khalasi, East Katras Colliery which was lodged before P. Jha, P.M. (IR) on 12-11-91 that the workman was not her husband rather her husband was Panku Bhuia. Basant Bhuian was said to be Basant Beldar, and was actually not the husband of Sabujwa Bhuini. Basant Bhuian denied all the allegation as false and mischievous and produced his registered deed of marriage wither along with the photo copies affixed to it. In the first enquiry both Panku Bhuia and Sabujwa Devi had claimed to be the husband and wife, and had one son and two daughters. The management admitted not to have verified whether they were husband and wife and they had children; although working in different collieries of Katras Area Sabujwa has stated that they were married prior to the nationalisation of the colliery, but the Panku has stated that they were married in 1977. Basant Bhuia stated that Sabujwa insisted for legal marriage on the ground of her doubt that Basant Bhuia might neglect her after getting the job under V.R.S. (Female). On the consideration of these facts, the Enquiry Officer K. S. Singh found the workman not guilty of the charge. The first enquiry into the charges against the workman did not prove, so the second enquiry for the same was not necessary. Further pleaded by the workman that the production of Form F of both Sabujwa and Panku Bhuia by the management could have easily proved a decisive factor the appointment of workman as fraudulent if Sabujwa was found to be the wife of Panku but that record was not also produced by the management in the second enquiry despite specific point to it. Moreover, the second enquiry for the same unproved charges without its justification is a bone of contention. Because of the fact that mere differences of the statement workman and Smt. Sabujwa Bhuini as husband and wife in their respective statement concerning their marriages, age and name of children etc. as noted in 4 points and accordingly recommended by the Project Officer, for his dismissal. It was agreed by Dy. C.P.M., on whose proposal the order of his dismissal from

his service was passed by the G. M. Katras Area which was quite unfair and improper and contrary to the natural justice for it was based on doubt only and without consideration of the illiterate status of Sabujwa Bhuini as well as the evidence and circumstances of the case. As such the punishment was alleged to be quite unfair. Further pleaded that the workman was chargesheeted after 6 years.

4. Whereas specifically denying the allegations made in the W.S. of the workman concerned, the pleaded case of the management is that the workman Basant Beldar appointed in the name of Basant Bhuia as the husband of Smt. Sabujwa Bhuini on her V.R.S. conspiredly as per appointment letter dated 3/4-6-1987, and he continued to work in the colliery without any objection. In the year 1981, it came to the light through Newspaper the "Awaj" dated 2-11-91 widely circulated in the locality that Sabujwa Bhuini was really the wife of Shri Panku Bhuia, a workman working the company in the same area but the surreptitiously gave the workman her employment on false and fabricated document. She and her husband Panku Bhuia gave their statement under their thumb impression before Shri P. Jha, the Personnel Manager of the Area that Shri Panku Bhuia was her real husband and the workman could not be her husband. On their statement as well as news circulated in the aforesaid newspaper, the workman was issued Chargesheet dated 15-11-1991 by the management for his misconduct of dishonesty and giving false information regarding relationship between the husband and wife under clause 26-1-11 and 26-1-12 of the Certified Standing Order. On his reply to the chargesheet Shri S.K. Singh, the Personnel Manager of Keshalpur Colliery though conducted the departmental enquiry in presence of the workman yet could not give any definite finding to the charges against him mentioning in his enquiry report—'The creation of confusion of all such informations and the circumstances thereof were too difficult to conclude it, so it was requested to appoint other Enquiry Officer to properly evaluate the evidence for definite finding over the relationship between the concerned workman and Smt. Sabujwa Bhuini, as it was a case of serious fraud practiced on the basis of manufactured document.'

5. Consequently Shri M. C. Yadav, the Personnel Manager of the area as per his appointment letter dated 17-7-92 of Dy. Chief Mining Engineer/Agent of Keshalpur Colliery, held the departmental enquiry as the Enquiry Officer in presence of the workman and his co-worker in accordance with the principle of natural justice. The earlier statement of aforesaid Panku Bhuia, the Dumper Khalasi of East Katras Colliery and Smt. Sabujwa Bhuini were proved by Shri P. Jha as a witness in the Enquiry. On fairly and properly conducting the enquiry, the Enquiry Officer

(Shri M. C. Yadav) submitted his enquiry report dated 28-1-1993 that in the service particulars of Panku Bhuia Smt. Sabujwa Bhuini was shown as his wife, with one son and one daughter aged 6 and 10 years old respectively as their dependents; since both of them were working in different collieries in the same area, the concerned workman somehow or the other influenced Smt. Sabujwa, and asked her to swear an affidavit declaring him as her husband so that he could get an employment and she could remain peacefully with him as husband and wife. The enquiry report also described the swearing of the affidavit by Smt. Sabujwa Bhuini on 20-11-1985 concerning the workman as her husband due to possibilities of some strain relationship between Panku Bhuia and her. The concerned workman got one marriage certificate on 2-1-1986 from Shri R. P. Singh, Marriage Officer, Chas describing him as the husband of Smt. Sabujwa Bhuini. On the consideration of those two documents, the management provided him employment. The fact remained concealed until its knowledge came to Shri Panku Bhuia who knew the details between his wife and the concerned workman, and represented it before the Press as well as before the management, challenging the authority of the no-called marriage and the employment of the concerned workman as the husband of his wife. On due consideration of the matter involved, the aforesaid Enquiry Officer, M. C. Yadav gave his finding concerning the workman as not husband of aforesaid Smt. Sabujwa, as well as the procurement of aforesaid both documents namely affidavit and the marriage certificate after the deal between the workman and Smt. Sabujwa Bhuini as per their settlement possibly based on the possibility of consideration of money payable to her by the workman. The possibility of quarrel amongst them in a period of four years or so was the cause for Smt. Sabujwa Bhuini and her husband Panku Bhuia to report the matter to the management and authorities concerned for drawing the present proceeding. As such the action of the management in dismissal of the workman from his service on the ground of misconduct of dishonesty with the forged document was alleged to be legal, justified and no entitlement of any relief to the workman.

6. As per the proved materials available on the case record, I find MW-2 Kripa Sankar Singh known as K. S. Singh, the Personnel Manager, as the Enquiry Officer after holding initial domestic enquiry into the charges levelled against the workman (in the year 1991) submitted his report Ext. M-5—"I fail to arrive into any conclusion. I requested the management to take up further enquiry against the concerned workman . . . , thereafter I was transferred to Block - II Area" as apparent from his deposition before this Tribunal. Since the first enquiry report (Ext. M-5) lacked concrete conclusion, of the aforesaid Mr. K. S. Singh (the

first enquiry officer) on account of certain confusion rendering it difficult for him to hold the concerned workman guilty for the charges stated in the chargesheet, MW-3 M. C. Yadav, Personnel Manager of Kessurgarh Colliery under the same Katras Area was duly appointed as the enquiry officer to hold the second domestic enquiry ("denovo") against the workman in the year 1992 identifying all the papers relating to the enquiry proceeding he proved the enquiry proceeding as Ext. M-1 to M-11. After completion of the domestic enquiry he submitted his enquiry report (Ext. M-9) to the Disciplinary authority wherein he had found the concerned workman guilty of the charges and thereafter the concerned workman was dismissed from his service. The evidence of MW-1 Deepak Kumar Viswakarma as the Legal Assistant of Katras office confirms his full awareness of the facts. So the aforesaid documents were produced and marked as exhibits mentioned above on the formal proof dispensed with. But the aforesaid MW-3 M. C. Yadav has proved all those documents concerning the enquiry proceeding as earlier mentioned which includes chargesheet, the enquiry report dated 28-1-93, notesheet and the dismissal order which have been proved as Exts. M-1, M-9, M-10 and Ext. M-11 respectively by the aforesaid Enquiry Officer before the Tribunal whereas WW-1 Basant Bhuia who is the workman himself has proved his two documents, the photo copy of alleged marriage certificate as Ext. W-1, (on no objection) and the death certificate in original of Sabujwa Bhuini as Ext. W-2 in support of his own case or claim.

7. Going through the documentary proof namely the Inquiry Report (Ext. M-9) in view of the charges under clause 26-1-11 and 26-1-12 of the Certified Standing Order (hereinafter referred to as C.S.O.), I find that the finding of MW-3 M. C. Yadav as the Enquiry Officer/Personnel Manager is based on the statement of Shri Ramji Singh, the management representative, Panku Bhuia and P. Jha, the Personnel Manager (both latter as Management witness No. 1 and 2 respectively) on behalf of the management and the statement of workman Basant Bhuia.

8. The statements of Panku Bhuia and his wife Smt. Sabujwa Bhuini personally recorded by Shri P. Jha the Personnel Manager on their complain dated 12-11-91 (Ext. M-8/9) before the Management prove that workman Basant Bhuia managed to obtain his employment as her fake husband fraudulently in place of her under Voluntary Retirement Scheme (female) but later on, aforesaid Panku Bhuia and her wife Smt. Sabujwa Bhuini turned hostile as managed by the workman himself. Moreover, the workman admitted in his statement to have mistakenly left the name of Smt. Sabujwa Bhuini as a nominee in (his service excerpt) Form 'F' so as such the real relation of the workman as

husband of Smt. Sabujwa Bhuini was found ambiguous which is evident from the Inquiry Report (Ext. M-3).

9. On the aforesaid ground, Shri M. C. Yadav (the then Personnel Manager) of Katras Area Office, as the Inquiry Officer held the workman concerned as the guilty of the charges. But the workman Basant Bhuia as WW-1 in support of his claim has also stated in his reply (Ext. M-2) that he was the husband of Smt. Sabujwa Bhuini but he has stated in his deposition that Panku Bhuia had stated in the enquiry proceeding that this Sabujwa Bhuini was not the wife rather another Sabujwa Bhuini was his wife. But the evidence of the workman about the existence of two women Sabujwa Bhuini being unpleaded is inadmissible in the eye of law. The workman's claim as the husband of disputed lady Sabujwa Bhuini rests upon the photo copy of his marriage certificate (Ext. W-1) which is not conclusive proof of his marriage with Sabujwa Bhuini because it relates to his alleged marriage with her on 23-6-79 which is apparently contrary to his oral evidence that he was married to her in 1976-78. The proof of death certificate of Sabujwa Bhuini as Ext. W-2 by him in course of his deposition has been proved to show him as her husband but this fact in lack of pleading loses his probity in the eye of law.

10. In the light of the evidence adduced on behalf of both the parties, Shri B. B. Pandey, the I.d. Counsel for the workman has submitted that no charges as levelled against the workman have been proved by the management and that he should be reinstated in service with back wages. Whereas Shri H. Nath, Ld. Advocate for the management seems to have irrationally conceded accordingly in favour of the workman but without back wages perhaps in view of the domestic enquiry which was already held unfair. But in the instant case after its scrutiny of the oral and documentary evidences of both the parties I find that out of two charges only the charge under clause 26-1-12 has been proved by the management crystal clearly against the concerned workman Basant Bhuia who gave false information regarding particulars of one Sabujwa Bhuini as his own wife for the purpose of the present employment. Accordingly on the recommendation (Ext. M-10) of the Project Officer, Keshalpur Colliery which is based on the enquiry report (Ext. M-9) of Shri M. C. Yadav of the Enquiry Officer the workman Shri Basant Bhuia has been dismissed from his service under clause 27-2-6 of the Certified Standing Order by the General Manager, Katras Area on 12-2-93 as per letter dated 14/17-2-93 (Ext. M-11) issued by the Project Officer concerned to the workman in view of the gravity of his aforesaid proved misconduct. Accordingly I hold that any employment obtained on false information is non-entity or nonest concerning this workman.

11. Under the circumstances I find and hold that the demand of the union for reinstatement of Basant Bhuia, ex-Miner/Loader, Keshalpur Colliery with effect from 17-2-93 by the management of Keshalpur Colliery under Katras Area of BCCL is quite un-justified. So the workman is not entitled to any relief whatsoever.

KISHORI RAM, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 11 फरवरी, 2011

का.आ. 736.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार सी.सी.एल. के प्रबंधन के संबंधित नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निविष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, नं. 1 धनबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 293/1999) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 11-02-2011 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-20012/117/1999-आई आर(सी-1)]

डी.एस.एस. श्रीनिवास राव, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 11th February, 2011

S.O. 736.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 293/1999) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 1 Dhanbad, as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. C.C.L., and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 11-02-2011.

[No. L-20012/117/1999-IR(C-I)]

D. S. S. SRINIVASA RAO, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL No. 2, AT DHANBAD

Present : Shri Kishori Ram, Presiding Officer

In the matter of an Industrial Dispute U/s. 10(1) (d) of the ID Act, 1947

Reference No. 293 of 1999

Parties : Employers in relation to the management of C.C.L. and their workman.

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the Workman : Mr. D. Mukherjee,
Advocate.

On behalf of the Employers: Mr. D. K. Verma, Advocate.

State : Jharkhand

Industry: Coal

Dated, Dhanbad, the 18th January, 2011

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour, in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1) (d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-20012/117/99-IR(C-I), dated, the 4th August, 1999.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the dismissal of Shri Bishun Ram, L.D.C. by the CCL Management from service w.e.f. 9-10-1988 is justified, proper and legal? If not what relief the workman entitled to?”

The case of workman as sponsored by the Union as pleaded in the Written Statement is that Sri Bishun Ram had been working as a permanent employee at Sirka Colliery of M/s. Central Coalfield Ltd. since long with unblemished record of service, Though he promptly submitted his reply to the false and baseless allegations contained in the chargesheet dt. 28-10-95 yet the management mala fide dismissed him from his services for his alleged misconducts :

- I. Theft, fraud or dishonesty in connection with the Employer's business or property.
- II. Wilful insubordination or disobedience whether alone or in conjunction with other or any lawful or reasonable order of a superior.
- III. Habitual late attendances and absence without leave or sufficient cause.
- IV. Habitual indiscipline.
- V. Leaving work without permission or sufficient reason.

The Enquiry was not conducted in accordance with the principles of natural justice, for a biased person was appointed as the Enquiry Officer, who conducted the enquiry without completing the cross-examination of one after another witness. Accordingly the Enquiry Report unbiased on the materials/evidence unreasonably submitted was perverse. The perverse finding amounts to violation of the principles of natural justice. Non-payment of subsistence allowance or even wages at the places of his frequent transfers on the dramatic evasive grounds of his non-joining to the workman during his suspension pending his enquiry until his dismissal is quite illegal, and it vitiates the entire enquiry. The workman was dismissed from his service for the charges which have not been conclusively proved. Though he filed an appeal against the order of the Disciplinary Authority yet in vain. Even the industrial

dispute raised before the Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central) Ranchi failed for the adamant attitude of the management. The dismissal of the workman is pleaded unjustified and illegal, so he is entitled to re-instatement with full back wages.

2. Whereas the pleaded case of the management is that workman Bishun Ram, Clerk Grade-II L.D.C. originally posted at Sirka Colliery of Argada Area was assigned the job of processing LTC/LLTC Bills of the employees of Sirka Project but regularly not attending to his duty, he engaged an outsider Md. Samsul for performing his official job on his behalf. On account of his unauthorised absenteeism, he was chargesheeted on 28-10-94 by the Project Officer concerned. On his reply to the charges, it was found unsatisfactory. It resulted in appointment of Shri Bijay Swaroop, Deputy Personnel Manager (EE), CCL, Ranchi as the Enquiry Officer by the competent authority to hold domestic enquiry against the concerned workman in accordance with the principle of natural justice. Thereafter observing the aforesaid principles of natural justice in the enquiry in which the workman along with his co-worker participated. The Enquiry Officer concluded it and submitted his report that charges levelled against the workman were proved and accordingly he was found guilty of the charges. On the consideration of the enquiry proceeding and the enquiry report, the Disciplinary Authority concerned by agreeing with the finding with the Enquiry Officer issued second show cause notice to the workman for his representation. On his representation, the disciplinary Authority through the application of his mind came to his conclusion that only termination of his service would meet the end of justice. So the order of his dismissal from his service was issued and his dismissal was quite legal and justified. Besides that the management has specifically denied the allegation as made out by the workman in his W. S. the management pleaded that the placement of a workman under suspension and serving of chargesheet are two courses of disciplinary action, but sometimes cover by the same order. Suspension of a workman does not support the master and servant relationship and the payment of subsistence allowance as per certain provision depends upon the fulfilment of certain obligations by the workman under suspension. So any dispute relating to subsistence allowance in no way vitiates the enquiry proceeding.

FINDING WITH REASONS

3. The perusal of the case record transpires that previously by Order dated 15-12-2005, the Tribunal ascertained the domestic enquiry was held fair, proper and in accordance with the principle of natural justice in this case. So the case matured for hearing argument on merit.

4. In exercise of the powers conferred upon the Tribunal by Section 11A of the I.D. Act, 1947, I have scrutinised the materials available on the record.

5. In the instant case, as per evidence of solitary witness Bijoy Swaroop as MW-1 who was the Personnel Manager and held the domestic enquiry as the legally authorised Enquiry Officer (Ext. M-3) into the charges as per the Chargesheet (Ext. M-1). The workman submitted his reply (Ext. M-2). On notice (Ext. M-4) to the workman, the workman appeared and defended his case through his co-worker Soab Khan. In course of the enquiry, the Enquiry Officer recorded the statement of the witnesses of both the parties including that of the concerned workman as Ext. M-5. The Enquiry Proceeding papers in the pen and signature of the aforesaid Enquiry Officer (MW-1) are Ext. M-6 series and the signatures of the workman on the proceeding papers are Ext. M-7 series and accordingly the signatures of Soab Khan the co-worker as Ext. M-8 series. After completion of the enquiry, he submitted his enquiry report (Ext. M-9) holding the concerned workman guilty of the charges and the copy of the enquiry report was sent to the workman as per the letter marked as Ext. M-10. It is also established that second show cause notice along with copy of the enquiry report was also sent to him and the workman also submitted his reply as Ext. M-11. Thereafter the Disciplinary Authority dismissed the workman from his services as per the letter marked as Ext. M-12, although aforesaid documents were marked exhibits without any objection.

6. The evidence of MW-1 Bijoy Swaroop, the aforesaid Enquiry Officer in the later part of his cross-examination establishes that the concerned workman had submitted his application (Ext. M-14) to him that he was not allowed to join on transfer and the management also refused to pay him his suspension allowance (subsistence) allowance and also that the workman had produced photo copy of medical certificate as (Ext. M-15) issued by the Private Doctor showing his treatment from 17-7-95 to 29-7-95, although the sanction and the payment of his sick leave for the disputed period were beyond his knowledge. The Enquiry Report (Ext. M-9 in 14 sheets) which is based on the statement of the management witnesses namely MW-1 Shri I.N. Jha, Manager Vigilance, CCL Ranchi, MW-2 Shri A.K. Sinha, Sr. P.O. and MW-3 Shri B.P. Singh, P.M., Sirka, and that of workman Bishun Ram, the proceeds as DW-1 (M-5) as recorded during the enquiry proceeding. Out of three charges as levelled against the workman Bishun Ram, Charge No. 1 related to not carrying out by the workman his official job of processing L.T.C./L.L.T.C. Bills of the workers of Sinka Project rather he engaged Md. Samsul an outsider in processing the bill on his behalf and charge No. 2

concerning his absentism from his duty on 29-7-95 and 24-8-95 alleging to have been proved against the workman. The Enquiry Officer held the workman guilty of first charge on the basis of the statement of Shri I. N. Jha that on his surprise check (as per surprise check report Ext. M-13/1) in Sirka Project at about 11.00 A.M. on 24-8-95 in presence of aforesaid B. P. Singh, P. M., he found the workman Bishun Ram absent but he suddenly appeared at about 2 P.M. and gave his own written statement (ME-2) admitting that he used to get L.T.C./L.L.T.C. bills prepared by one Md. Samsul. This fact also stands corroborated by Shri B. P. Singh, P. M., MW-3 and also by the workman Bishun Ram, (W-1) in his own statement (Ext. M-5), in which he has admitted that due to work load he used to take his home the bill concerned and he himself did the job of bill, but at time he got the bills afresh by his house hold members. But his such statement of the workman appears to be a little bit different from his show cause reply (Ext. M-2) only to the extent of the preparation of the bills by Md. Samsul only. besides that B. P. Singh (MW-3) has corroborated the fact that the workman had voluntarily written his statement (ME-II) before aforesaid Shri I. N. Jha that he used to get the bills concerned prepared by Samsul. The workman in his reply (Ext. M-2) also had admitted to have taken the help from Md. Samsul whenever heavy accumulation occurred and it was to the knowledge of the officials, as that the poor educational background, he was not in a position to discharge the job of writing in good manner ... On that proof the aforesaid first charge concerning the preparation of the official bills by another person instead of the workman in his official capacity stands proved.

7. So far as the Charges No. II is concerned it relates to habitual unauthorised absentism of the workman concerned from his duty on 29-7-95 and on 24-8-95 as found on the surprise check. As per the surprise check report dated 29-7-95 and 24-8-95 (Ext. M-13/1) respectively as stated in the enquiry report (Ext. M-9), the workman Bishun Ram was found absent from his duty on the aforesaid dates when the surprise check held by Shri I. N. Jha Dy. C.V.M., CCL Ranchi in presence of Shri A.K. Sinha, Sr. P.O. and one Shri B. P. Singh, P.M. at Sirka respectively and the attendance register (ME-1) had no mark of presence for the aforesaid first date being blank, it was confirmed by Shri A.K. Sinha that no leave application of the concerned workman was made available to him. Shri B. P. Singh also confirmed that in course of the surprise check on 24-8-95 at about 11.00 A.M., the workman was not present but he appeared there at 2 P.M. and the workman stated to have gone to Area Accounts office which is contrary to his admitted fact as stated in his W.S. that after knowing the arrival of Shri I. N. Jha from Ranchi, he (workman) had come from his house and rushed to the

office to see him. It is also evident from the cross-examination of the workman during the enquiry proceeding that he was absent from duty on 24-8-1995. So the second charge of absentism was proved. The finding of the Enquiry Officer Shri. Bijoy Swaroop MW-1 appears to be reasoned and justified.

8. First contention of Shri D. Mukherjee, Ld. Counsel for the workman with reference to authority 1983 Lab. I. C. page 1909 SC (CB) (D) M/s. Glaxo Laboratories (I) Ltd. versus Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Meerut and others concerning Section 13A of the I.E. (S.O) Act (20 of 1946) as held therein that misconduct neither defined nor enumerated and it may be believed by the employer to be misconduct ex-post-facto would not expose the workman to a penalty (paras-23). In that prospective, Ld. Counsel for the workman submits that in the instant case no charges have been proved against the workman and as such the dismissal on any ground other than the charges mentioned in the chargesheet is illegal. Whereas Mr. D. K. Verma, Ld. Advocate for the management responded that the charges I and II as mentioned in the Chargesheet (Ext. M-1) falling under specific S.O. as well defined and enumerated in the Industrial Employment (SO) Central Rules, 1946 have been very specifically established against the workman in course of enquiry proceeding by the Enquiry Officer Bijoy Swaroop who has been examined as MW-1 before the Tribunal. In the instance case I find that Charge No. I wilful insubordination or disobedience and Charge No. II habitual absentism without leave or without sufficient cause rather are well defined under aforesaid S.O. 17 (i) (c) and (d) respectively, though apparently the chargesheet mentions "S.O. 18(i) (c) and S.O. (i) (d) in place of aforesaid S.O. 17 (i) (c) S.O. (i) and (d) respectively. but misenumeration of the aforesaid relevant S.O. in the face of specific charges defined therein cannot obliterate or obscure the departmental proceeding which has already been held fair and proper by this Tribunal. Thus I accordingly hold the argument of the Ld. Counsel for the workman cuts no ice with me.

9. Secondly, the plea of the Ld. Counsel for the workman with the citation of 1999 L.L.R. 499 SC (DB), Capt. M. Paul Authority Anthony - Versus - Bharat Gold Mines Ltd. and others is, as held therein under B, that 'Non-payment of subsistence allowance to a suspended employee is an inhuman act which be likened to slow-poisoning. The provision for payment of subsistence allowance made in the Service Rules only ensures non-violation of right to life of the employees, 'as also held that' since in the instant case the appellant was not provided any subsistence allowance during the period of suspension ... on account of his penury occasioned by

non-payment of subsistence allowance, he could not undertake a journey to attend the disciplinary proceeding, the findings recorded by the Enquiry Officer at such proceeding, which were held ex-parte stand vitiated (para-32). In the present case under adjudication, I find that the workman concerned has fully participated in the domestic enquiry, but the deprivation of the workman from his subsistence allowance during his suspension is admittedly a glaring example of inhuman dealing with him in course of domestic enquiry and his suspension period. It is apparent from the chargesheet (Ext. M-1) and the application (Ext. M-14) made by the applicant that he was not allowed to join on transfer and also the management refused to pay his suspension allowance as admitted by MW-1 Bijoy Swroop the Personnel Manager as the Enquiry Officer asserted in his deposition. The Industrial Employment (SO) Central Rules, 1946 applicable to the present case, under its order 17" with the heading Disciplinary Action for Misconduct - (i) mandatorily postulates as such —

"A workman may be suspended by the employer pending investigation or departmental enquiry and shall be paid subsistence allowance in accordance with the provisions of Section 10 - (a) of the Act (Industrial Employment Standing Orders Act, 1946."

Under Section 10A of the said Act, the employer has not complied with the mandatory provision of law relating to the payment of his subsistence allowance to the workman. Thus the argument by the Ld. Counsel for the workman appears to be plausible in the eye of law. On the consideration of the materials available on the case record, I find that the charges No. I and II relating to insubordination and absentism for two specified dates have been proved against the workman in the domestic enquiry which was held fair and proper. In that aspect, Shri D. K. Verma, Ld. Counsel for the management relying upon the authorities : (208) 1 SCC (L. & S) 890 (DB), West Bokaro Colliery, (Tisco. Ltd) - versus - Ram Pravesh Singh as held therein, submits that 'where two views are possible, Industrial Tribunal should be very slow in interfering the findings arrived in the domestic enquiry, the standard of proof in the domestic enquiry is preponderance of probabilities and not proof beyond reasonable doubt; it was improper for the Tribunal to interfere with the findings of the domestic enquiry on the ground that there was no independent evidence apart from management witnesses ... however, general provision of law accepted is that Labour Court can award lesser punishment in a given case (paras 18 and 21.) But in the present case there are no two views on the evidence brought before the Tribunal as held earlier. Further it has been submitted on behalf of the Ld. Counsel for the management with

reference to the authority 2005 S CC (L & S) 407 (DB) A as held therein, that, in case of misappropriation of fund by delinquent employee, the punishment may be awarded on the consideration of two factors - loss of confidence as the primary factor and not the amount of money misappropriated; when an employee is found guilty of misappropriation of a corporation's fund there is nothing wrong in the corporation losing confidence or faith in such an employee and awarding punishment of dismissal; in such cases there is no place for generosity or misplaced sympathy on the part of the judicial forms and there interfering with the quantum of punishment (paras 12 and 13). But unfortunately, the present case relates to the fact of absentism of the workman for two specified dates and also to insubordination concerning the preparation of L.T.C./L.L.T.C. Bill by one Md. Samsul instead of the workman. It is different from the factum of the aforesaid authorities, moreover, the case has no double views on the evidence and the materials available on the case record.

10. In view of the preceding discussed facts and laws, it is pertinent to mention that I find the punishment of dismissal to the concerned workman for his aforesaid insubordination and absentism for two dates appears to be too harsh and inappropriate, to the nature of his aforesaid two guilts. Section 11A of the I.D. Act, 1947 empowers this Tribunal with the discretionary power to set aside the order of dismissal to its satisfaction, based on the materials only. In the instant case under this circumstances I find and hold in view of the aforesaid prove two charges, namely insubordination and two days absentism the workman ought to have been awarded with lesser punishment, not with his dismissal from his permanent service. Hence, the dismissal of the workman from his service is set aside and the management is directed to reinstate the workman Bishun Ram, L.D.C. in his service with full back wages with stoppage of one increment for his aforesaid minor misconduct from the date of his dismissal.

11. In the result, it is held the dismissal of Shri Bishun Ram, L.D.C. by the CCI management from his service with effect from 9-10-1998 is unjustified, improper and illegal. But in view of his suffering he deserves compensation of his suffering during his suspension to the tune of Rs. 10,000 (Rupees Ten thousand). He is entitled to reinstatement of his service with back wages in full minus one increment with effect from the aforesaid date. The management is directed to implement the award within three months from the date of its publication in the Gazette of India.

KISHORI RAM, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 11 फरवरी, 2011

का.आ. 737.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार बी.सी.सी.एल. के बरारी कोलियरी के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण नं. 1, धनबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 32/2001) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 11-02-2011 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-20012/417/2000-आईआर (सी-1)]

डी. एस. एस. श्रीनिवास राव, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 11th February, 2011

S.O. 737.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 32/2001) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court -1, Dhanbad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bararee Colliery of BCCL and their workmen which was received by the Central Government on 11-02-2011.

[No. L-20012/417/2000-IR (C-I)]

D. S. S. SRINIVASA RAO, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1, DHANBAD

In the matter of a reference U/s. 10 (1) (d) (2A) of I. D. Act

Reference No. 32 of 2001

Parties : Employers in relation to the management of
Barari Colliery of M/s. BCCL.

And

Their workmen

Present : Shri H. M. Singh, Presiding Officer

APPEARANCES:

For the Employers : Shri D. K. Verma, Advocate

For the Workman : Shri R. A. Chamarla, Advocate

State : Jharkhand.

Industry : Coal.

dated the 31-1-2011

AWARD

By Order No. L-20012/417/2000-IR (C-I) dated 25-1-2001 the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour has, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal :—

“Whether the action of the management of Bararee Colliery of BCCL in not providing employment on compassionate ground to Smt. Indu Devi, wife of Late Rampyare Dusadh is proper and justified? If not, to what relief Smt. Indu Devi is entitled to?”

2. The case of Smt. Indu Devi, the dependent wife of Rampyare Dusadh, who was employed as General Mazdoor holding Employee No. 101592, C. M. P. F. No. JHA/20/65, P.No. 00917674 in Bararee Colliery of M/s. B.C.C.Ltd. Rampyare Dusadh expired on 21-12-1993, while in employment due to cardiorespiratory failure. After death of her husband Smt. Indu Devi submitted application dated 14-5-1994 for her employment at the earliest possible opportunity. There was no other sources of income for livelihood of the surviving family members. Subsequently Smt. Indu Devi had submitted applications on various dates for providing employment and also submitted affidavit as required. She also had submitted affidavit dated 4-5-94 and another affidavit dated 20-4-1998 bearing no objection by Baban Lal Dusadh, the younger brother of late Rampyare Dusadh. After receiving application from Smt. Indu Devi for employment, the management prepared a Check List in respect of providing employment to her. They had verified the genuineness of her application by the concerned officers and also by police. The verification report was also submitted to the employer. Jharkhand Janta Mazdoor Union had sent a letter dated 17-5-1999 to the employers requesting therein to provide employment to the applicant, Smt. Indu Devi. The employer did not provide employment to Smt. Indu Devi and delayed the matter on a pretext or other. The management sought for some documents vide letter dated 23/24-5-96 and another letter dt. 7-11-96. She was also asked for monetary benefits in lieu of employment to which she denied. Again letter dated 18-1-98 and letter dated 19-3-98 were sent to her requiring further clarification and documents. After all the management did not provide employment to Smt. Indu Devi and kept the matter pending since 1994 and at last vide letter dated 2-4-99 regretted to provide employment but no reason for same was mentioned. Seeing no other alternative, an industrial dispute was raised before A.L.C. (C), Dhanbad, which ended in failure, resulting to the present dispute.

It has been prayed that this Hon'ble Tribunal be pleased to pass an award directing the management to provide employment to Smt. Indu Devi, wife of late Rampyare Dusadh and also to pay wages and benefits for the period she has not been provided employment i.e. since 1995 till the date she is taken into employment.

3. The case of the management is that Smt. Indu Devi is not a workman within the meaning of Sec. 2-S of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. Therefore, the Union has got no locus standi to demand employment through raising industrial dispute. The employment in Public Sector Undertaking are a Public employment and the provision of employment under Compassionate ground is ultravires of Art. 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India and the Hon'ble

Supreme Court of India also held in the various cases that the compassionate appointment is not a legal right. Smt. Indu Devi claimed employment in the year 1997, whereas Late Ram Pyare Dusadh expired on 12-12-93. Smt. Indu Devi has not claimed employment after the death of Late Ram Pyare Dusadh immediately, whereas the provisions under NCWA for providing employment for immediate relief and as she has not claimed any relief immediately, her claim cannot be considered after lapse of years together.

4. Both the parties have filed their respective rejoinder admitting and denying the contents of some of the paragraphs of each other's written statement.

5. Smt. Indu Devi, wife of Late Ram Pyare Dusadh, has examined herself as WW-1 and proved some documents which have been marked as Exts. W-1 to W-13.

The management has examined Sri T. S. G. Rao, Personnel Manager of Bararee Colliery, as MW-1, who has proved some documents which have been marked as Exts. M-1 to M-5.

6. Main argument advanced on behalf of the concerned workman is that Smt. Indu Devi had given her application in the year 1994 and it was not considered.

Management's counsel argued that she had given application in the year 1998 as per Ext. W-2. Regarding Ext. W-1 shows that it had not been received by any employee of the management because in Ext. W-1 at page 1, it shows that receipt was close but no seal or signature is there, so it cannot be presumed that her application was received in the year 1995 or 1994, though on 2nd page 14-5-94 has been mentioned, but it has not been received by the management, so it has got no merit. Ext. W-3 shows that she filed application on 13-8-99.

Another argument advanced on behalf of the management in that the concerned lady, WW-1, Indu Devi, has stated in her cross-examination that at the time of death of her husband she was residing at Augarpathra. Bararee Colliery is far away from Augarpathra. No death certificate has been issued from Angarpathra village or any public authority where the alleged husband of the concerned lady was residing. Death certificate has been issued by Dr. S. Saha. This certificate has been issued from Dhanbad. No document has been filed by the applicant, Indu Devi which may show that she had been residing with her husband at the time of his death. Ext. M1 shows that she has moved application for giving employment without any date and Ext. M-2 shows that she had given her application for giving her employment on 24-4-98 though her husband, Ram Pyare Dusadh, died in 1993. As per Ext. M-3 Ram Pyare Dusadh was residing at village Parshewa, P.O. Tarari (Kanch), Dist. Gaya. But no death certificate has been issued from above village.

Another argument advanced on behalf of the management is that the concerned applicant has stated her age as 28 years on 6-1-11. As her date of birth in Service Excerpt finds 21 years on 17-7-87 as well as Annexure-I shows that the lady who has been examined as WW-1 is, different from that lady whose name and age finds in Service Excerpt because on 17-7-87 in Service Excerpt her age is 21 years, it cannot be 28 years on 6-1-11. Moreover, on affidavit which is Annexure-6 the age of Indu Devi finds on 4-5-94 as 28 years. That cannot be 28 years on 6-1-11. WW-1, Indu Devi, stated in her cross-examination that the name of the mother of her husband is Chumki Devi. But as per Affidavit (Ext. M-4) which has been filed allegedly by the mother of Ram Pyare Dusadh, husband of alleged Indu Devi, her name is Sonaki Devi and not Chumki Devi. It also shows that she is not able to know the name of her husband's mother.

7. Considering the above facts it show that Indu Devi has not been able to prove that she was wife of alleged Ram Pyare Dusadh and in such circumstances the action of the management of Bararee Colliery of BCCL in not providing employment on compassionate ground to Smt. Indu Devi, wife of Late Ram Pyare Dusadh is proper and justified. As such, the concerned lady, Smt. Indu Devi is not entitled to any relief.

This is my Award.

H. M. SINGH, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 11 फरवरी, 2011

का.आ. 738.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एयरोफ्लोट रशियन एयरलाइन्स के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय दिल्ली नं.1 के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 11/2010) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 11-02-2011 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-20025/01/2011-आईआर (सी 1)]

डी. एस. एस. श्रीनिवास राव, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 11th February, 2011

S.O. 738.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 11/2010) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court -1, Delhi as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. Aeroflot Russian Airliens, and their workmen, received by the Central Government on 11-02-2011.

[No. L 20025/01/2011-IR (C-1)]

D. S. S. SRINIVASA RAO, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE DR. R. K. YADAV, PRESIDING OFFICER,
CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1,
KARKARDOOMA COURTS COMPLEX, DELHI**

I. D. No. 11/2010

M/s. Aeroflot Russian Airlines,
Ground Floor, 15-17, Tolstoy House,
Tolstoy Marg, New Delhi - 110001.

...Applicant/Management

Versus

Shri Jagpal
R/o RZ-131-Z, X, Block,
Nazafgarh, New Delhi - 110043.

...Respondent/Workman

AWARD

Ground handling services were undertaken by Aeroflot Russian International Airlines, (hereinafter referred to as the Airlines) at I.G. I. Airport, New Delhi. The Airlines has employed a handful of employees for that purpose. Vide circular dated 28th of September, 2007, Director General, Civil Aviation, took a decision to enlist agencies which can undertake ground handling services on various aerodromes. In anticipation of that decision, a press release was made by the Press Information Bureau, Government of India, New Delhi on 1st of February, 2007, informing that approval has been granted by Ministry of Civil Aviation regarding ground handling policy at Metropolitan Airports, including I.G.I. Airport, New Delhi. It was detailed in the Press Release that ground handling services at Metropolitan Airports would be carried out by respective Airport Operators itself by its joint venture and the Airlines, involved in ground handling will not be permitted to undertake self handling w.e.f. 1st of January, 2009. On the date of the press release, the Airlines was doing self handling at IGI Airport, New Delhi. The Press Release made employees of the Airlines panicky about their future. They started approaching other agencies for employment and informed the Airlines that they would take employment elsewhere. 22 employees including operators of the Airlines tendered their resignation in August, 2007. Since ramp ground handling service require high level of cooperation and team work in a fixed time frame hence ramp ground handling services cannot be engaged in peace-meal and on account of resignation of its employees the Airlines took a decision to request Combata Civil Aviation Pvt. Ltd. to provide complete ramp ground handling service, to them.

2. Aeroflot Employees Union (hereinafter referred to as the Union) raised an industrial dispute against the Airlines through demand letter dated 2nd of May 2005. Since the Airlines failed to consider their demands, the Union was left with no option but to initiate conciliation

proceedings by way of filing a claim statement before the Conciliation Officer. When conciliation proceedings failed, a failure report was submitted by the Conciliation Officer to the appropriate Government. On consideration of that failure report, the appropriate Government had referred a dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication, vide order No. L-11012/11/2006-IR(CM-I), New Delhi dated 1st of June, 2006 wherein issues relating to demand of proper pay scales and other facilities under well defined service conditions applicable to the employees of the Airlines, doing ground handling jobs, were sent for adjudication.

3. During the pendency of the said dispute for adjudication, Rishi Pal, Suresh Kumar, Sunil Kumar Rathi and Jagpal were served with charge sheet, wherein allegations were levelled that on 28-3-07, it was reported by them to a new channel that there was a great security threat at I.G. I. Airport, New Delhi due to actions of the Airlines, besides allegations that the aforesaid employees, who were working from last 12 years, claimed that they were not aware for whom they were working despite the fact that they were employees of the Airlines. Replies, submitted by the aforesaid employees to the charge sheets referred above, were found to be not satisfactory. The Airlines took a decision to hold a domestic enquiry in the charges levelled against the aforesaid employees and appointed an enquiry officer vide order dated 4-5-07. The Enquiry Officer conducted an enquiry ex-parte, when charge sheeted employees opted not to participate in the enquiry. He submitted his report dated 1-8-07 to the Airlines. Show cause notice dated 4-8-07 against the proposed punishment of dismissal from service was served on charge sheeted employees. Explanation offered by the charge sheeted employees were found to be not satisfactory. Charge sheeted employees were dismissed from service vide order dated 14-8-07. The Airlines preferred approval applications, as contemplated by clause (b) of sub-section (2) of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (in short the Act) and paid an amount of Rs.7500 each to them, being equal to one month's salary, by money orders dated 14-8-2007, in lieu of one month's notice. A prayer was made to this Tribunal to accord approval to the action of Airlines in dismissing the services of the charge sheeted employees.

4. In reply to the approval applications it was projected that Shri Suresh Kumar was the President, Rishi Pal was General Secretary, Jagpal was Secretary and Sunil Kumar Rathi was ordinary member of the Union. The Union sought status of protected workman for them, by moving appropriate applications as well as seeking declaration from A. L. C. in that regard. It was agitated that when Airlines failed to respond to their applications within 15 days time frame, it was assumed that the aforesaid employees were granted status of protected workman. A claim was made that the Airlines cannot terminate services of protected workman, save with express permission in writing of the Tribunal before whom dispute, relating to proper pay scales and other facilities under well defined service conditions,

was pending adjudication. The Union projected that the approval applications, moved by the Airlines are irrelevant, since an industrial dispute pends adjudication. A claim was made that the approval applications may be dismissed.

5. When report of the Enquiry Officer was under consideration, the Union moved an application before this Tribunal on 16-7-2007, seeking directions to restrain the Airlines from changing service conditions of members of the Union, besides seeking status of protected employees in terms of sub-section (4) of Section 33 of the Act read with rule 61 of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules 1957 (in short the Rules). The said application was disposed of by this tribunal vide order dated 13-8-2007, commanding the Airlines to comply the provisions of Section 33 of the Act, in case it opts to discharge or dismiss the charge sheeted employees.

6. The Airlines dismissed the employees referred above, which issue was raised by them before Conciliation Officer by way of filing a claim statement. Conciliation proceedings resulted into a failure. Conciliation Officer submitted his report to the appropriate Government, as contemplated by sub-section (4) of section 12 of the Act. On consideration of the said failure report, the appropriate Government referred the dispute to this Tribunal, vide order No.L-110012/4/2008 -IR(CM-I), New Delhi dated 14th of August, 2008 with following terms:

“Whether the action of the management of Russian International Airlines, New Delhi, in dismissing the services of S/Shri Suresh Kumar, Jagpal, Sunil Kumar Rathi and Rishi Pal is justified and legal ?

2. To what relief are the concerned workmen entitled ?”

7. Claim statement was filed, in response to the above reference, by the Union pleading that despite orders passed by this Tribunal, the Airlines terminated services of two office bearers and one ordinary members of the Union, who were protected employees. It went on to detail that the Union sought status of protected workman from the Airlines vide its letter dated 13th of December, 2006, which communication was not responded to. Though there was an obligation on the Airlines to reply the said communication within a period of 15 days, as contemplated by sub rule (2) of rule 61 of the Rules, yet the Airlines opted to maintain an eerie silence. The Union moved Assistant Labour Commissioner for seeking a declaration of protected workman. Since the aforesaid employees were protected workmen, the Airlines was under an obligation to obtain prior permission of this Tribunal to terminate their services. Since their case was covered by sub-section (3) of section 33 of the Act, the approval applications moved by the Airlines are irrelevant. The Airlines acted in utter disregard to the order dated 13-8-2007 passed by the Tribunal. It was projected that this Tribunal may not approve the illegal action taken by the Airlines, dismissing the aforesaid employees from their services and to reinstate them in

service with continuity, full back wages, and consequential benefits.

8. In reply to the approval applications it was projected that Shri Suresh Kumar was the President, Shri Rishi Pal was general Secretary, Jagpal was Secretary and Sunil Kumar Rathi was the ordinary members of the Union. The Union sought status of protected workman for them by moving appropriate applications as well as seeking declaration from Assistant Labour Commissioner in that regard. It was agitated that when the Airlines failed to reply their application within 15 days time framed, it was presumed that the aforesaid employees were granted status of protected workman. The Airlines cannot terminate services of protected workman, save with express permission in writing of the Tribunal, before whom dispute relating to the issue raised by the Union for proper pay scales and other facilities under well defined service conditions was pending adjudication. Approval applications are irrelevant, claims the Union.

9. The Airlines demurred the claim that the employees referred above had committed serious acts of misconduct, hence they were charge sheeted vide charge sheet dated 5th of April, 2007. Explanation submitted by them were found to be unsatisfactory, hence a decision was taken to hold domestic enquiry. Shri Jitesh Pandey, an independent and impartial person, was appointed as Enquiry Officer, vide letter dated 4-5-2007. Shri Pandey conducted the enquiry in accordance with the principles of natural justice and submitted his report dated 1st of August, 2007 to the Airlines. Since charges stood proved against the aforesaid employees, they were served with a show cause notice dated 4-8-2007, alongwith the copy of the enquiry report, calling them to submit their explanations as to why they should not be dismissed from service. Explanation submitted by them were considered and found to be unsatisfactory. The Airlines decided to dismiss their services. Accordingly their services were dismissed vide letter dated 14-8-2007. Since an industrial dispute was pending before this Tribunal, approval applications as contemplated by clause (b) of sub-section (2) of Section 33 of the Act were moved and simultaneously one months salary was sent to them by money order. It has been disputed that the aforesaid employees were protected workmen. The Airlines claimed that letter dated 13-12-06 and its postal receipts were manipulated documents. No such letter was ever received by Airlines hence there was no question of its reply. It has been projected that when ramp ground handling services were given to Combata Civil Aviation Pvt. Ltd., the Airlines had to retrench 29 employees on 14th of September, 2007. Since the Airlines is not doing ramp ground handling services, claim of the Union for reinstatement of the services of the aforesaid employees had become infructuous. The Airlines projected that the provisions of clause (b) of sub-section (2) of Section 33 of the Act are applicable to the controversy under reference, hence approval applications were moved. The dismissed employees were never declared as protected

employees, hence claim of the Union that provisions of sub-section (3) of Section 33 of the Act are attracted, is uncalled for. It has been agitated that the dispute referred by the Government may be dismissed and action of dismissal of the aforesaid employees may be approved.

10. On approval applications following issues were settled:

1. Whether the claimant was protected workman ?
2. Whether action of the management in terminating the services of the workman is legal, fair and justified? If yes, whether approval needs to be granted to the management ?
3. Relief.

11. Though no issue as to virus of the enquiry proceedings was settled in the approval application, yet the Tribunal thought it expedient to deal that proposition at thresh-hold. Parties called upon to adduce evidence on that proposition. To discharge onus resting on it, Airlines examined Shri Jitesh Pandey, the Enquiry Officer. The Union brought Shri Suresh Kumar in the witness box to rebut facts unfolded by Shri Pandey. No other witness was examined by either of the parties.

12. After hearing Shri M. K. Dwivedi, authorized representative for the Airlines, and Shri M.A. Niazi, authorized representative of the Union and on appreciation of evidence produced by the parties, issue relating to virus of the enquiry was adjudicated vide order dated 12-11-2010 and it was concluded that the enquiry conducted by the Airlines was neither just nor fair nor proper. It was commanded that order dated 14-8-07, on the strength of which charge sheeted employees were dismissed, cannot be given a favourable node.

13. When question relating to virus of enquiry proceedings has been answered against the management and an industrial dispute for adjudication of justifiability and legality of dismissal of the aforesaid employees pends articulation, a proposition arises as to whether approval applications have lost its efficacy. Hence parties were heard. Shri M. A. Niazi, authorised representative, raised his submissions on behalf of the Union. Shri M. K. Dwivedi authorised representative, presented his point of view on behalf of the Airlines. I have given my careful consideration to the arguments advanced at the bar and perused the record. My findings on issues involved in the controversy are as follows.

14. In Bhagubhai Balubhai Patel, (1976 Lab. I.C. 4) the Apex Court ruled that the jurisdiction under section 33 of the Act is confined only to see whether a prima facie case has been made out and the Authority "does not sit as a court of appeal, weighing or appreciating the evidence for itself but only examines the findings of the Enquiry Officer on the evidence in domestic enquiry as it is, in order to find out either whether there is a prima facie case or if the findings are pervers" for arriving at the finding

that the charge has been proved, but stuck to the adjudication scrutiny of the domestic enquiry and the bonafides of the employer. Accordingly, it is open to the Authority under section 33 of the Act to review the findings of fact arrived at in the domestic enquiry, the question of adequacy or sufficiency of the evidence, however, were not considered relevant in this limited jurisdiction, by the Apex Court in Lord Krishna Textiles Mills [1961 (1) L.L.J.211]. The Apex Court detailed the scope of two fold approach to the problem by an Authority under section 33 of the Act in granting or refusing permission in Bhagubhai Balubhai Patel (supra) in the following words:

"Firstly in a case where there is no defect in procedure in the course of a domestic enquiry into the charges for misconduct against an employee, the Tribunal can interfere with an order of dismissal on one or other of the following conditions:-

- (1) If there is no legal evidence at all recorded in the domestic enquiry against the concerned employee with reference to the charge or if no reasonable person can arrive at a conclusion of guilt on the charge levelled against the employee on the evidence recorded against him in the domestic enquiry. This is what is known as perverse finding.
- (2) Even if there is some legal evidence in the domestic enquiry but there is no prima facie case of guilt made out against the person charged for the offence even on the basis that the evidence so recorded is reliable. Such a case may overlap to some extent with the second part of the condition No.1 above. A prima facie case is not, as in a criminal case, a case proved to the hilt.

It must be made clear in following the above principles, one or the other, as may be applicable in a particular case, the Tribunal does not sit as a court of appeal, weighing or reappreciating the evidence for itself but only examines the finding of the enquiry officer on the evidence in the domestic enquiry as it is in order to find out either whether there is a prima facie case or if the findings are perverse.

Secondly, in the same case, i.e., where there is no failure of the principles of natural justice, in the course of domestic enquiry, if the Tribunal finds that dismissal of an employee is by way of victimisation or unfair labour practice, it will then have complete jurisdiction to interfere with the order of dismissal passed in the domestic enquiry. In that event the fact that there is no violation of the principles of natural justice in the course of the domestic enquiry will absolutely lose its importance or efficacy."

15. The enquiry contemplated by clause (b) of sub-section (2) of Section 33 of the Act, with respect to the validity and legality of the domestic enquiry, is of very limited nature. The Tribunal can disregard the findings entered by the Enquiry Officer only if they are perverse. A finding can be said to be perverse in case not supported by legal evidence. If the finding is not perverse one and if

there is a prima facie evidence to support the finding, the Authority under section 33 of the Act cannot refuse to grant approval to the order passed by the management. Reference can be made to K. N. Mohanan [1993(II) L.L.J. 514]. The Apex Court in catena of precedents, in parallel to reference cases under section 10 of the Act has ruled that even under section 33, where employer had held no enquiry or the domestic enquiry held by him is found to be vitiated by the Tribunal, the right of the employer to justify action of discharge or dismissal taken by him against the delinquent workman by adducing relevant evidence, for the first time before the Authority is well recognized. Reference can be made to the precedents in Bharat Sugar Mills Ltd. [1961 (II) LLJ 644], Ritz Theatre (Pvt.) Ltd. [1962 (II) LLJ 498], P.H.Kalyani [1963 (I) LLJ 679], Motipur Sugar Factory (Pvt.) Ltd. [1965 (II) LLJ 162] Jitendra Chandrakar [1971 (I) LLJ 543], Ganesh Dutt [1972 (I) LLJ 172], Firestone Tyre & Rubber Company of India (Pvt.) Ltd. [1973 (I) LLJ 278], Bhagubhai Balubhai Patel (supra), Britania Biscuit Company Ltd. [1977(I) LLJ 197] and K. M. Dev (1985 Lab. I C. 254). Likewise right of the workman to lead evidence contra has been recognized. In such cases the entire matter is open before the Authority, which will have jurisdiction not only to go into the limited question of validity of the enquiry and the bonafides of the employer but also to satisfy itself, on facts before it, whether the action was justified. In other words, in such situation jurisdiction of the Authority is not confined to prima facie examination of the employer's action and the Authority can come to his own conclusion on consideration of evidence adduced before it. Reference can be made to the precedent in Motipur Sugar Factory Pvt. Ltd. (supra), Firestone Tyre and Rubber Company of India Ltd. (supra) and Radio and Electricals Manufacturing Company Ltd. [1978 (II) LLJ 131].

16. As detailed above, jurisdiction of this Tribunal under section 33 of the Act has been made parallel to its jurisdiction under section 10 of the Act. What the Tribunal is required to adjudicate on this approval application, that very course is available to the parties when dispute referred above would be articulated. Two remedies are open to the workman viz. he may lodge a complaint under section 33-A or seek prosecution of the Airlines under section 31 (1) or may seek a reference under section 10 and have its adjudication when he claims contravention of the provisions of Section 33 of the Act. Since approval application was moved, the only recourse adopted by the charge sheeted employees was under section 10 of the Act and a dispute was referred by the appropriate Government to this Tribunal for adjudication. In case these applications are disposed of, pending adjudication of the reference, doctrine of prejudice cannot rob the Airlines of its right to prove misconduct of the charge sheeted employee and adjudication of the dispute referred by the appropriate Government. Pendency of these approval applications will only multiply the litigation.

17. The rights or defences, which are available to the Airlines in these approval applications, can be claimed

by it in the adjudication of the reference. Therefore, it is thought expedient to dispose of these approval applications with a command that disposal of the approval applications by this award will be subject to the outcome of the dispute, referred by the appropriate Government to this Tribunal. Consequently, approval applications are disposed of with a command that the award passed herein would be subject to the findings that would be recorded on adjudication of the dispute referred by the appropriate Government. An award is, accordingly, passed. It be sent to the appropriate Government for publication.

Dated: 07-01-2011

Dr. R. K. YADAV, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 11 फरवरी, 2011

का.आ. 739.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एयरोफ्लोट रशियन एयरलाइन्स के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय दिल्ली न.1 के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 12/2010) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 11-02-2011 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-20025/01/2011-आईआर (सी 1)]

डी. एस. एस. श्रीनिवास राव, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 11th January, 2011

S.O. 739.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No.12/2010) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court-1, Delhi as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. Aeroflot Russian Airlines, and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 11-02-2011.

[No. L-20025/01/2011-IR (C-1)]

D. S. S. SRINIVASA RAO, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE DR. R. K. YADAV, PRESIDING OFFICER,
CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1,
KARKARDOOMA COURTS COMPLEX, DELHI**

I. D. No. 12/2010

M/s. Aeroflot Russian Airlines,
Ground Floor, 15-17, Tolstoy House,
Tolstoy Marg, New Delhi -110001.

... Applicant/Management

Versus

Shri Suresh Kumar
S/o Harichander,
R/o 1443, Saini Mohalla,
Nazafgarh, New Delhi -110043.

... Respondent/workman

AWARD

Ground handling services were undertaken by Aeroflot Russian International Airlines, (hereinafter referred to as the Airlines) at I.G.I. Airport, New Delhi. The Airlines has employed a handful of employees for that purpose. Vide circular dated 28th of September, 2007, Director General, Civil Aviation, took a decision to enlist agencies which can undertake ground handling services on various aerodroms. In anticipation of that decision, a press release was made by the Press Information Bureau, Government of India, New Delhi on 1st of February, 2007, informing that approval has been granted by Ministry of Civil Aviation regarding ground handling policy at Metropolitan Airports, including I.G.I. Airport, New Delhi. It was detailed in the Press Release that ground handling services at Metropolitan Airports would be carried out by respective Airport Operators itself by its joint venture and the Airlines, involved in ground handling will not be permitted to undertake self handling w.e.f. 1st of January, 2009. On the date of the press release, the Airlines was doing self handling at IGI Airport, New Delhi. The Press Release made employees of the Airlines panicky about their future. They started approaching other agencies for employment and informed the Airlines that they would take employment elsewhere. 22 employees including operators of the Airlines tendered their resignation in August, 2007. Since ramp ground handling service require high level of cooperation and team work in a fixed time frame hence ramp ground handling services cannot be engaged in peace-meal and on account of resignation of its employees the Airlines took a decision to request Combata Civil Aviation Pvt. Ltd. to provide complete ramp ground handling service, to them.

2. Aeroflot Employees Union (hereinafter referred to as the Union) raised an industrial dispute against the Airlines through demand letter dated 2nd of May 2005. Since the Airlines failed to consider their demands, the Union was left with no option but to initiate conciliation proceedings by way of filing a claim statement before the Conciliation Officer. When conciliation proceedings failed, a failure report was submitted by the Conciliation Officer to the appropriate Government. On consideration of that failure report, the appropriate Government had referred a dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication, vide order No. U-11012/II/2006-IR(CM-I), New Delhi dated 1st of June, 2006 wherein issues relating to demand of proper pay scales and other facilities under well defined service conditions applicable to the employees of the Airlines, doing ground handling jobs, were sent for adjudication.

3. During the pendency of the said dispute for adjudication, Rishi Pal, Suresh Kumar, Sunil Kumar Rathi and Jagpal were served with charge-sheet, wherein allegations were levelled that on 28-3-07, it was reported by them to a new channel that there was a great security threat at I.G.I. Airport, New Delhi due to actions of the Airlines, besides allegations that the aforesaid employees, who were working from last 12 years, claimed that they were not aware for whom they were working despite the

fact that they were employees of the Airlines. Replies, submitted by the aforesaid employees to the charge-sheets referred above, were found to be not satisfactory. The Airlines took a decision to hold a domestic enquiry in the charges levelled against the aforesaid employees and appointed an enquiry officer vide order dated 4-5-07. The Enquiry Officer conducted an enquiry ex-parte, when charge-sheeted employees opted not to participate in the enquiry. He submitted his report dated 1-8-07 to the Airlines. Show cause notice dated 4-8-07 against the proposed punishment of dismissal from service was served on charge sheeted employees. Explanation offered by the charge-sheeted employees were found to be not satisfactory. Charge-sheeted employees were dismissed from service vide order dated 14-8-07. The Airlines preferred approval applications, as contemplated by clause (b) of sub-section (2) of section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (in short the Act) and paid an amount of Rs.7500 each to them, being equal to one month's salary, by money orders dated 14-8-2007, in lieu of one month's notice. A prayer was made to this Tribunal to accord approval to the action of Airlines in dismissing the services of the charge sheeted employees.

4. In reply to the approval applications it was projected that Shri Suresh Kumar was the President, Rishi Pal was General Secretary, Jagpal was Secretary and Sunil Kumar Rathi was ordinary member of the Union. The Union sought status of protected workman for them, by moving appropriate applications as well as seeking declaration from A. L. C. in that regard. It was agitated that when Airlines failed to respond to their applications within 15 days time frame, it was assumed that the aforesaid employees were granted status of protected workman. A claim was made that the Airlines cannot terminate services of protected workman, save with express permission in writing of the Tribunal before whom dispute, relating to proper pay scales and other facilities under well defined service conditions, was pending adjudication. The Union projected that the approval applications, moved by the Airlines are irrelevant, since an industrial dispute pends adjudication. A claim was made that the approval applications may be dismissed.

5. When report of the Enquiry Officer was under consideration, the Union moved an application before this Tribunal on 16-7-2007, seeking directions to restrain the Airlines from changing service conditions of members of the Union, besides seeking status of protected employees in terms of sub-section (4) of section 33 of the Act read with rule 61 of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957 (in short the Rules). The said application was disposed of by this tribunal vide order dated 13-8-2007, commanding the Airlines to comply the provisions of Section 33 of the Act, in case it opts to discharge or dismiss the charge-sheeted employees.

6. The Airlines dismissed the employees referred above, which issue was raised by them before Conciliation Officer by way of filing a claim statement. Conciliation proceedings resulted into a failure. Conciliation Officer

submitted his report to the appropriate Government, as contemplated by sub-section (4) of section 12 of the Act. On consideration of the said failure report, the appropriate Government referred the dispute to this Tribunal, vide order No. L-110012/4/2008 -IR(CM-I), New Delhi dated 14th of August, 2008 with following terms:

"Whether the action of the management of Russian International Airlines, New Delhi, in dismissing the services of S/Shri Suresh Kumar, Jagpal, Sunil Kumar Rathi and Rishi Pal is justified and legal ?

2. To what relief are the concerned workmen entitled ?"

7. Claim statement was filed, in response to the above reference, by the Union pleading that despite orders passed by this Tribunal, the Airlines terminated services of two office bearers and one ordinary members of the Union, who were protected employees. It went on to detail that the Union sought status of protected workman from the Airlines vide its letter dated 13th of December, 2006, which communication was not responded to. Though there was an obligation on the Airlines to reply the said communication within a period of 15 days, as contemplated by sub-rule (2) of rule 61 of the Rules, yet the Airlines opted to maintain an eerie silence. The Union moved Assistant Labour Commissioner for seeking a declaration of protected workman. Since the aforesaid employees were protected workmen, the Airlines was under an obligation to obtain prior permission of this Tribunal to terminate their services. Since their case was covered by sub section (3) of section 33 of the Act, the approval applications moved by the Airlines are irrelevant. The Airlines acted in utter disregard to the order dated 13-8-2007 passed by the Tribunal. It was projected that this Tribunal may not approve the illegal action taken by the Airlines, dismissing the aforesaid employees from their services and to reinstate them in service with continuity, full back wages, and consequential benefits.

8. In reply to the approval applications it was projected that Shri Suresh Kumar was the President, Shri Rishi Pal was General Secretary, Jagpal was Secretary and Sunil Kumar Rathi was the ordinary member of the Union. The Union sought status of protected workman for them by moving appropriate applications as well as seeking declaration from Assistant Labour Commissioner in that regard. It was agitated that when the Airlines failed to reply their application within 15 days time framed, it was presumed that the aforesaid employees were granted status of protected workman. The Airlines cannot terminate services of protected workman, save with express permission in writing of the Tribunal, before whom dispute relating to the issue raised by the Union for proper pay scales and other facilities under well defined service conditions was pending adjudication. Approval applications are irrelevant, claims the Union.

9. The Airlines demurred the claim that the employees referred above had committed serious acts of

misconduct, hence they were charge-sheeted vide charge sheet dated 5th of April, 2007. Explanation submitted by them were found to be unsatisfactory, hence a decision was taken to hold domestic enquiry. Shri Jitesh Pandey, an independent and impartial person, was appointed as Enquiry Officer, vide letter dated 4-5-2007. Shri Pandey conducted the enquiry in accordance with the principles of natural justice and submitted his report dated 1st of August, 2007 to the Airlines. Since charges stood proved against the aforesaid employees, they were served with a show cause notice dated 4-8-2007, alongwith the copy of the enquiry report, calling them to submit their explanations as to why they should not be dismissed from service. Explanation submitted by them were considered and found to be unsatisfactory. The Airlines decided to dismiss their services. Accordingly their services were dismissed vide letter dated 14-8-2007. Since an industrial dispute was pending before this Tribunal, approval applications as contemplated by clause (b) of sub-section (2) of section 33 of the Act were moved and simultaneously one months salary was sent to them by money order. It has been disputed that the aforesaid employees were protected workmen. The Airlines claimed that letter dated 13-12-06 and its postal receipts were manipulated documents. No such letter was ever received by Airlines hence there was no question of its reply. It has been projected that when ramp ground handling services were given to Combata Civil Aviation Pvt. Ltd., the Airlines had to retrench 29 employees on 14th of September, 2007. Since the Airlines is not doing ramp ground handling services, claim of the Union for reinstatement of the services of the aforesaid employees had become infructuous. The Airlines projected that the provisions of clause (b) of sub-section (2) of section 33 of the Act are applicable to the controversy under reference, hence approval applications were moved. The dismissed employees were never declared as protected employees, hence claim of the Union that provisions of sub-section (3) of section 33 of the Act are attracted, is uncalled for. It has been agitated that the dispute referred by the Government may be dismissed and action of dismissal of the aforesaid employees may be approved.

10. On approval applications following issues were settled:

1. Whether the claimant was protected workman ?
2. Whether action of the management in terminating the services of the workman is legal, fair and justified? If yes, whether approval needs to be granted to the management ?
3. Relief.

11. Though no issue as to virus of the enquiry proceedings was settled in the approval application, yet the Tribunal thought it expedient to deal that proposition at thresh-hold. Parties called upon to adduce evidence on that proposition. To discharge onus resting on it, Airlines examined Shri Jiteshh Pandey, the Enquiry Officer. The

Union brought Shri Suresh Kumar in the witness box to rebut facts unfolded by Shri Pandey. No other witness was examined by either of the parties.

12. After hearing Shri M. K. Dwivedi, authorized representative for the Airlines, and Shri M.A. Niazi, authorized representative of the Union and on appreciation of evidence produced by the parties, issue relating to virus of the enquiry was adjudicated vide order dated 12-11-2010 and it was concluded that the enquiry conducted by the Airlines was neither just nor fair nor proper. It was commanded that order dated 14-8-07, on the strength of which charge sheeted employees were dismissed, cannot be given a favourable node.

13. When question relating to virus of enquiry proceedings has been answered against the management and an industrial dispute for adjudication of justifiability and legality of dismissal of the aforesaid employees pends articulation, a proposition arises as to whether approval applications have lost its efficacy. Hence parties were heard. Shri M. A. Niazi, authorised representative, raised his submissions on behalf of the Union. Shri M. K. Dwivedi authorised representative, presented his point of view on behalf of the Airlines. I have given my careful consideration to the arguments advanced at the bar and perused the record. My findings on issues involved in the controversy are as follows.

14. In Bhagubhai Balubhai Patel, (1976 Lab.I.C. 4) the Apex Court ruled that the jurisdiction under Section 33 of the Act is confined only to see whether a prima facie case has been made out and the Authority "does not sit as a court of appeal, weighing or appreciating the evidence for itself but only examines the findings of the Enquiry Officer on the evidence in domestic enquiry as it is, in order to find out either whether there is a prima facie case or if the findings are pervers" for arriving at the finding that the charge has been proved, but stuck to the adjudication scrutiny of the domestic enquiry and the bonafides of the employer. Accordingly, it is open to the Authority under section 33 of the Act to review the findings of fact arrived at in the domestic enquiry, the question of adequacy or sufficiency of the evidence, however, were not considered relevant in this limited jurisdiction, by the Apex Court in Lord Krishna Textiles Mills [1961 (1) L.L.J.211]. The Apex Court detailed the scope of two fold approach to the problem by an Authority under section 33 of the Act in granting or refusing permission in Bhagubhai Balubhai Patel (supra) in the following words:

"Firstly in a case where there is no defect in procedure in the course of a domestic enquiry into the charges for misconduct against an employee, the Tribunal can interfere with an order of dismissal on one or other of the following conditions:-

- (1) If there is no legal evidence at all recorded in the domestic enquiry against the concerned employee with reference to the charge or if no reasonable person can arrive at a conclusion of guilt on the

charge levelled against the employee on the evidence recorded against him in the domestic enquiry. This is what is known as perverse finding.

- (2) Even if there is some legal evidence in the domestic enquiry but there is no prima facie case of guilt made out against the person charged for the offence even on the basis that the evidence so recorded is reliable. Such a case may overlap to some extent with the second part of the condition No.1 above. A prima facie case is not, as in a criminal case, a case proved to the hilt.

It must be made clear in following the above principles, one or the other, as may be applicable in a particular case, the Tribunal does not sit as a court of appeal, weighing or reappreciating the evidence for itself but only examines the finding of the enquiry officer on the evidence in the domestic enquiry as it is in order to find out either whether there is a prima facie case or if the findings are perverse.

Secondly, in the same case, i.e., where there is no failure of the principles of natural justice, in the course of domestic enquiry, if the Tribunal finds that dismissal of an employee is by way of victimisation or unfair labour practice, it will then have complete jurisdiction to interfere with the order of dismissal passed in the domestic enquiry. In that event the fact that there is no violation of the principles of natural justice in the course of the domestic enquiry will absolutely lose its importance or efficacy."

15. The enquiry contemplated by clause (b) of sub-section (2) of Section 33 of the Act, with respect to the validity and legality of the domestic enquiry, is of very limited nature. The Tribunal can disregard the findings entered by the Enquiry Officer only if they are perverse. A finding can be said to be perverse in case not supported by legal evidence. If the finding is not perverse one and if there is a prima facie evidence to support the finding, the Authority under section 33 of the Act cannot refuse to grant approval to the order passed by the management. Reference can be made to K. N. Mohanan [1993(11) L.L.J. 514]. The Apex Court in catena of precedents, in parallel to reference cases under section 10 of the Act has ruled that even under section 33, where employer had held no enquiry or the domestic enquiry held by him is found to be vitiated by the Tribunal, the right of the employer to justify action of discharge or dismissal taken by him against the delinquent workman by adducing relevant evidence, for the first time before the Authority is well recognized. Reference can be made to the precedents in Bharat Sugar Mills Ltd. (1961 (II) LLJ 644), Ritz Theatre (Pvt.) Ltd. [1962 (II) LLJ 498], P.H.Kalyani [1963 (I) LLJ 679], Motipur Sugar Factory (Pvt.) Ltd. [1965 (II) LLJ 162] Jitendra Chandrakar [1971 (I) LLJ 543], Ganesh Dutt [1972 (I) LLJ 172], Firestone Tyre & Rubber Company of India (Pvt.) Ltd. [1973 (I) LLJ 278], Bhagubhai Balubhai Patel (supra), Britannia Biscuit Company Ltd. [1977(1) LLJ 197] and K. M. Dev [1985 Lab.I C. 254]. Likewise right of the workman to lead evidence

contra has been recognized. In such cases the entire matter is open before the Authority, which will have jurisdiction not only to go into the limited question of validity of the enquiry and the bonafides of the employer but also to satisfy itself, on facts before it, whether the action was justified. In other words, in such situation jurisdiction of the Authority is not confined to prima facie examination of the employer's action and the Authority can come to his own conclusion on consideration of evidence adduced before it. Reference can be made to the precedent in Motipur Sugar Factory Pvt. Ltd. (supra), Firestone Tyre and Rubber Company of India Ltd. (supra) and Radio and Electricals Manufacturing Company Ltd. [1978 (II) LLJ 131].

16. As detailed above, jurisdiction of this Tribunal under section 33 of the Act has been made parallel to its jurisdiction under section 10 of the Act. What the Tribunal is required to adjudicate on this approval application, that very course is available to the parties when dispute referred above would be articulated. Two remedies are open to the workman viz. he may lodge a complaint under section 33-A or seek prosecution of the Airlines under section 31 (1) or may seek a reference under section 10 and have its adjudication when he claims contravention of the provisions of section 33 of the Act. Since approval application was moved, the only recourse adopted by the charge sheeted employees was under section 10 of the Act and a dispute was referred by the appropriate Government to this Tribunal for adjudication. In case these applications are disposed of, pending adjudication of the reference, doctrine of prejudice cannot rob the Airlines of its right to prove misconduct of the charge sheeted employee and adjudication of the dispute referred by the appropriate Government. Pendency of these approval applications will only multiply the litigation.

17. The rights or defences, which are available to the Airlines in these approval applications, can be claimed by it in the adjudication of the reference. Therefore, it is thought expedient to dispose of these approval applications with a command that disposal of the approval applications by this award will be subject to the outcome of the dispute, referred by the appropriate Government to this Tribunal. Consequently, approval applications are disposed of with a command that the award passed herein would be subject to the findings that would be recorded on adjudication of the dispute referred by the appropriate Government. An award is, accordingly, passed. It be sent to the appropriate Government for publication.

Dated: 07-01-2011

Dr. R. K. YADAV, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 17 फरवरी, 2011

का.आ. 740.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार डिपार्टमेंट ऑफ पोस्ट के प्रबंधन के संबंध में निर्यातकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक

अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय जयपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 38/2005) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 17-02-2011 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40012/152/2004-आईआर (डीयू)]

डी. एस. एस. श्रीनिवास राव, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 17th February, 2011

S.O. 740.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 38/05) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Jaipur as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Department of Post and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 17-02-2011.

[No. L-40012/152/2004-IR (DU)]

D. S. S. SRINIVASA RAO, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL - CUM - LABOUR COURT, JAIPUR

I. D. 38/05

Reference No. L-40012/152/2004-IR (DU) Dated : 17-2-05

Shri Rana Ram

S/o Shri Vishna Ram Choudhary

Village Pabusar, Tehsil : Shergarh,

Distt : Jodhpur

....Applicant

V/s

1. The Post Master General,
Rajasthan Western Region,
Jodhpur

2. The Senior Superintendent of Post Offices
Jodhpur Division,
Jodhpur

...Non-Aplicants

Present :

Presiding Officer : Sh. N. K. Purohit

For the Applicant : Ex-party

For the non -Applicant : Sh. Gaurav Jain

AWARD

31-1-2011

1. The Central Government in exercise of the powers conferred under clause (d) of Sub section 1 and 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 has referred the following Industrial dispute to this tribunal for adjudication which runs as under: -

" Whether the action of the management of Post Master General, Department of Post, Western Zone, Jodhpur and Senior Superintendent of Post Office, Jodhpur in terminating the services of their workman Shri Ranaram S/o Shri Vishnaram Choudhary, Incharge Updakpal, Panchayat Sanchar Kendra, Pabusar, Tehsil-Shergarh, Distt. Jodhpur w.e.f. 1-6-2004 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?"

2. The applicant in his statement has pleaded that he was appointed as post incharge of Panchayat Sanchar Seva Kendra, Gram panchayat, Pabusar vide order dated 28-2-2001 but his service was terminated orally on 1-6-04 in violation of Section 25 F. It has been further pleaded that non-applicant has appointed Shri Shankar Ram as Dakpal on 2-6-2004 on the pretext that the post of Dakpal is reserved for candidate belonging to Schedule tribe. It has also been alleged that non-applicant did not prepare seniority list & junior to the applicant have been retained in service while terminating service of the applicant. Therefore, action of the non-applicant is in violation of Section 25 (H) & (G) also. The applicant has prayed for his reinstatement with full back wages & consequential benefits.

3. The non-applicant while disputing the claim of the applicant has averred in its reply that the applicant Rana Ram was engaged as an agent of Panchayat Sanchar Seva Kendra. He was paid Rs. 600 p.m. as fixed allowance & incentive. The non-applicant has further contended that the applicant was appointed as an agent by the Gram Panchayat, Pabusar. Subsequently, vide office Memorandum dated PLG WR/ 1/ 19-Pabusar dated 9-12-03 of the Post Master General, Rajasthan, Western Zone, Jodhpur sanction for post office, Pabusar was accorded & in pursuance of the said O. M. post office was opened at Pabusar & Panchayat Sanchar Seva Kendra was terminated vide O. M. H- 5/Pabusar/Setrawa/03-04 dated 12-12-03.

4. The non-applicant has further averred that the claimant's appointment as temporary Dakpal, Pabusar was till regular appointment of the Dakpal. It has also been averred that after publishing the vacancy for the post of regular Dakpal which was reserved for the candidate belonging to Schedule tribe Shri Shanker Lal Meghwal was selected against the said post on 2-6-04. The applicant had worked as temporary Dakpal, Pabusar for the period from 15-12-03 to 1.6.04. Thus, he had not worked for more than 240 days. The non-applicant has further averred that prior to appointment as temporary Dakpal the applicant had worked as an agent, Panchayat Sanchar Seva Kendra and he was selected for the post of agent by the Gram Panchayat, Pabusar.

5. The non applicant has also averred that in such Gram Panchayat where there was no post office, Panchayat Sanchar Seva Kendra were opened under an agreement between the department and panchayat concerned to

provide dak facilities. It has further been submitted that as per declaration dated 15-12-03 given by the claimant, he was bound to hand over the charge to the regular appointee on the post of Dakpal. Thus, the temporary arrangement for the post of Dakpal ceased after regular appointment of the Dakpal on 2-6-04.

6. On the basis of pleading of the parties following points for determination were made:-

- i. Whether the workman was appointed as Post In-charge by the non-applicant management on 28-1-2001, who continuously worked till 1-6-2004, on which date his service was terminated in violation of Section 25-F of the Act?
- ii. Whether after the termination of the workman's service, the non-applicant management has appointed Sh. Shankar Ram on 2-6-2004 in his place in violation of Section 25-H of the Act?
- iii. Whether at the time of terminating the service of the workman, the junior employees to him were retained by the non-applicant management in violation of Section 25-G of the Act?
- iv. Whether the non-applicant establishment is not an industry as defined under Section 2-J of the Act?
- v. Relief, if any.
- vi. Whether the claimant is a workman?

7. After both the parties filed their document in support of their respective case, the applicant at the stage of his evidence did not appear, therefore, ex-parte proceedings were drawn against the applicant on 19-8-10. The non-applicant also did not adduce evidence and moved an application stating therein that since the applicant has failed to adduce any evidence in support of his claim "No Claim Award" may be passed in this matter.

8. Heard the learned representative on behalf of the non-applicant & perused the record.

Point No. I

9. Before a workman can claim retrenchment not being in compliance with Section 25 F of the I. D. Act, he has to show that he has been in continuous service of not less than one year with the employer who had retrenched him. As per sub-section (1) of 25 B of the Act, the workman shall be said to be in continuous service for one year if he has been in the employment of the employer for the continuous, uninterrupted period of one year except the period the absence is permissible under the said section. As per sub-section 1 of Section 25 B even if the workman is not in continuous service within the meaning of clause (i) of sub-section (1) of 25 B for the period of one year, he shall be deemed to be in continuous service for that period

under an employer if he has actually worked for 240 days in the preceding period of twelve months from the date of his termination.

10. Since the non-applicant has denied the claim of the applicant initial burden was on the applicant to show that he had worked for 240 days in preceding 12 months prior to his alleged termination or he was in continuous service within the meaning of clause (i) of sub-section (1) of Section 25 B for the period of one year.

11. The applicant in support of his claim has produced the photo copies of the vouchers no. 1 to 29 which are pertaining to the period 1-11-01 to 18-12-03. Upon perusal of the record produced by the applicant, it is evident that these vouchers are pertaining to payment of monthly allowance & incentives amount payable to incharge, panchayat sanchar seva Kendra & said payments have been verified by the sarpanch, gram panchayat, Pabuser. It further reveals that the applicant had worked as an agent panchayat sanchar seva kendra during period August, 2001 to 15 December, 2003.

12. The non-applicant has produced the copy of resolution passed by the gram panchayat, Pabuser on 20-5-01 & copy of the letter of sarpanch dated 20-5-01 addressed to senior post superintendent, Jodhpur regarding establishing panchayat sanchar seva at Pabuser which show that the applicant selection for agent, panchayat sanchar seva Kendra was done by the Gram Panchayat. The non-applicant has also produced the copy of the declaration dated 15-12-03 given by Rana Ram workman. The relevant portion of the said document is as under :—

“मेरी नियुक्ति शाखा डाकपाल पाबूसर के पद पर प्रवर अधीक्षक डाकघर जोधपुर खण्ड जोधपुर ने तदर्थ एवं पूर्ण अस्थाई रूप से की है जब तक इस पद पर किसी को भी स्थाई रूप से नियुक्ति होने पर प्रवर अधीक्षक डाक जोधपुर मुझे बिना किसी नोटिस दिये इस पद से हटा सकते हैं तथा मैं स्वेच्छा से तथा बिना किसी कानूनी कार्यवाही के शाखा डाकपाल पाबूसर का चार्ज स्थाई रूप से नियुक्त व्यक्ति को या प्रवर अधीक्षक डाकघर जोधपुर के आदेशानुसार तुरन्त स्थानान्तरित कर दूंगा।

13. It is evident from the above declaration that the claimant was temporarily appointed as Dakpal till regular appointment of the Dakpal, Pabuser. Apart this, from the documents produced by the non-applicant it reveals that the applicant had taken charge on the said post on 15-12-03 & he was disengaged after appointment of regular Dakpal on 1-6-04. Prior to 15-12-03, he was simply working as an agent of panchayat sanchar seva Kendra under an agreement between the department & panchayat sanchar seva Kendra as per O.M.No.H-5 Pabuser 03- 04 dated: 12-12-03. Therefore, while working as agent of the Seva Kendra during period for 28-2-2001 to 14-12-03 he was not working as an employee of the non-applicant Department.

On perusal of record, it also appears that during period from 15-12-03 to 1-6-04 he had worked as temporary Dakpal but the said period is less than 240 days. Under these circumstances, after appointment of regular Dakpal through selection process on 2-6-04, disengagement of the applicant on 1-6-04 without any notice or compensation in lieu of notice is not in violation of Section 25 F of I. D. Act.

Point No. II

14. It is an admitted fact that Shri Shanker Ram was appointed as Dakpal, Post office, Pabuser on 2-6-2006. The applicant has pleaded that instead of appointing him as regular Dakpal Shri Shanker Ram has been appointed on the said post on the pretext that above post is reserved for candidate of Schedule Tribe. The applicant has not adduced any oral evidence in support of his case. Moreover, on perusal of the appointment letter of the applicant which is on the record, it is evident that his appointment was a stop gap arrangement till regular appointment of the Dakpal. Therefore, on the basis of documents on record it is not established that appointment of the Shri Shanker Ram was in violation of Section 25(II). This point is also decided against the applicant.

Point No. III

15. The applicant in his claim statement has not disclosed the name of the person alleged to be retained in violation of Section 25(H) of I. D. Act. There is neither pleading nor any evidence that other person in the category of applicant's post were working with the non-applicant while terminating the service of the applicant. Thus, applicant has failed to prove alleged violation of Section 25 (H) of I. D. Act by the non-applicant.

Point No. IV

16. The non-applicant has taken preliminary objection in its reply that non-applicant Department is not an 'Industry'. But Hon'ble three judges Bench of the Hon'ble Apex Court in 1998 DNJ (SC 94) G. M. Telecom v/s S. Srinivas Rao & others, has held that Telecom Department of Union of India is an 'Industry' & earlier decision rendered in (1996) 8 SCC 489 & AIR 1997 SC 2817 have been overruled. Therefore, in the light of above decision this point is decided against the non-applicant.

Point No. VI

17. As per Section 2 (S) of I. D. Act any person employed in any industry to do any manual, unskilled, skilled, technical, operational, clerical or supervisory work for hire or reward is a workman. A person whose dismissal, disengagement retrenchment has led to a industrial dispute have also been included in the definition of a workman but categories of a person specified in clause (i) to (iv) have been excluded under this section. In the present case during period from 15-12-03 to 1-6-04 the applicant had worked as temporary Dakpal under the employment of the non-

applicant. It is not the case of the applicant that he was employed as such mainly in a managerial or administrative capacity or being employed in supervisory capacity, he was drawing wages in excess to the amount mentioned in the sub clause (iv) of sub-section (2) of I.D.Act. In view of above it cannot be said that the applicant was not 'workman' within the definition of 2(S) of the I.D.Act.

Point No.V

18. In the result, the reference is answered in negative against the applicant & it is held that the action of the non-applicant in terminating the service of the applicant w.e.f. 1-6-04 is legal & justified,

19. Resultantly, the applicant is not entitled to any relief. The reference under adjudication is answered accordingly.

20. Award as above.

N. K. PUROHIT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 17 फरवरी, 2011

का.आ. 741.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार बी.एस.एन.एल.के के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, नागपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या सीजीआईटी/एनजीपी/68/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 17-02-2011 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40011/57/2003-आईआर (डी.यू.)]

डी. एस. एस. श्रीनिवास राव, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 17th February, 2011

S.O. 741.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. CGIT/NGP/68/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Nagpur as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of BSNL and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 17-02-2011.

[No. L-40011/57/2003-IR (DU)]

D. S. S. SRINIVASA RAO, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI J. P. CHAND, PRESIDING OFFICER,
CGIT-CUM-LABOUR COURT, NAGPUR

Case No. CGIT/NGP/68/2004 Date : 07-02-2011

Party No. 1 :

The General Manager,
Telecom, BSNL,
Behind Jayant Talkies
CHANDRAPUR.

Versus

Party No. 2 :

The Branch Secretary,
National Federation of Telecom,
Employees, M/s BSNL, O/o Sub
Divisional Office (Phones),
CHANDRAPUR.

AWARD

(Dated : 7th February, 2011)

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2 (A) of Section 10 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) ("the Act" in short), the Central Government has referred the industrial dispute between the employers, in relation to the management of BSNL and their workman, Shri Vishvanath Ratan Mahataw for adjudication, as per letter No. L 40011/57/2003-IR (DU) dated 19-7-2004, with the following schedule :-

"Whether the action of the management in relation to General Manager, BSNL, Chandrapur in terminating the service of Sh. Vishvanath Ratan Mahataw, Ex-Sweeper by verbal order instead of regularisation her in service as per the decasualization policy of the department is legal and justified? If not, what is the relief to which the workman is entitled?"

2. On receipt of the reference, notices were issued to the parties to file their respective statement of claim and written statement, in response to which, the workman, Shri Vishvanath Ratan Mahataw ("the workman" in short) filed his statement of claim and the management of B.S.N.L. ("the Party No. 1" in short) filed their written statement.

3. The case of the workman is that he was working with the Party No.1 with effect from 1st April, 1997, as a part time sweeper and initially he was working at D.T.O. building, Chandrapur and he was doing four hours duty, commencing from 8.00 AM to 12.00 noon and the nature of his duty was to clean the lavatory, bathroom and sweeping of office and the building premises and in the year 1999, he was transferred to another office of the Party No. 1, situated near the Railway Station, Chandrapur and there also, he was doing the same work on the same wages of Rs. 560 per month and he had done continuous service of 4 1/2 years and he had also completed 240 days compulsory service in every completed year, so as per the departmental policy of the Party No.1, he was required to be regularized by the Party No. 1 as full time worker and afterward to be promoted as Group 'D' employee of the department. It is the further case of the workman that his record was not maintained by the Party No.1 and his wages were being paid on I.B. and ACG- 17 departmental money receipt book and no muster roll was maintained on day-to-day basis and the same was being done in order to circumvent his right of regular

employee accrued by virtue of doing 240 days of service in one calendar year and even though, there was instruction from the higher authorities of the Party No.1 for regularization of all part time workers to regular mazdoor category, the Party No.1 did not pay any heed to his legitimate claim for regularization and by adopting unfair labour practice, his service was terminated illegally without following the due procedure of law and principle of natural justice and the National Federation of Telecom Employees, BSNL, Chandrapur submitted a representation to the Chief General Manager, Telecom, BSNL, Chandrapur on 2-8-2004 for reinstating him and the post on which, he was working was still lying vacant and all the records pertaining to his attendance and payment are with the Party No.1 under lock and key and as such, it was not possible for him to procure the said records and to produce the same in support of his claim and he filed a complaint through his union before the ALC (C), Chandrapur on 5-2-2003, but the conciliation proceedings were ended in failure. The workman has prayed to declare his oral termination as illegal and void and to set aside the same and for his reinstatement in service with effect from October, 2002, with continuity of service and payment of back wages and other allowances.

3. The Party No.1 in its written statement denying all the allegations made in the statement of claim has pleaded inter-alia that the workman was never appointed by its as part time Sweeper and he had not completed 240 days of continuous service in one calendar year and the departmental policy as mentioned by the workman in the statement of claim is applicable to the employees who have been duly appointed as per rules as part time of full time workers and who have been enrolled in its muster roll and it is a government company and it is duty bound to maintain the records and as the workman was at no point of time in its employment, the question of maintaining muster roll and attendance register in respect of him (workman) does not arise and no document has been filed by the workman showing payment of wages to him by it and as the workman was never appointed by it at any point of time, question of his termination intentionally or deliberately does not arise at all and the workman has filed false complaints against it and as such, the reference is liable to be answered in the negative and the Annexure R-1, the list of the part time workers as on 1-12-1996 and their regularization w.e.f. 11-9-2001, maintained by it does not reveal the name of the workman, which shows that, the claim of the workman that he was appointed as a part time sweeper is not true and as such, he is not entitled for any relief.

4. In support of their respective claims, parties were allowed to adduce evidence. The workman examined himself as a witness in support of his case. One Shri Asharam Mehetav Chawre the Divisional Engineer

(Admn) was examined on behalf of the Party No.1 as a witness. Both the parties relied on documentary evidence also.

The workman in his evidence given on affidavit reiterated the facts mentioned by him in his statement of claim in toto. However, in his cross-examination, he has stated that his name is registered in the Employment Exchange and BSNL issues advertisement for employing Grade 'D' also and there was no advertisement when he applied and he was not called through Employment Exchange and no interview was taken and his mother was serving twenty years earlier to his joining and as his mother became ill, she stopped working since 1997 and he did not apply mentioning the illness of his mother.

The witness for the management has stated that the workman was never appointed by the Party No.1 as a part time sweeper and the workman had not done 240 days of continuous service in one calendar year and the person, who were in employment of Party No.1 had been regularized as per annexure R-1 (Ext.M-3). In his cross-examination, this witness has stated that he was working since 1988 at Chandrapur BSNL office and retired on 30-9-2006 and earlier, form ACG-17 was being used for making payment of small amount to the labourers engaged for loading and unloading articles.

It is necessary to mention there that during the cross-examination of this witness, he was confronted with the xerox copies of the document (mentioned as document No.1) and was asked as to whether such format was being used by the Party No.1 and the same having a stamp of the office. However, the witness in reply has stated that he cannot say anything on the basis of the xerox copies of the document.

5. In the written notes of argument, it was submitted by the learned advocate for the workman that the workman was working with the Party No.1 w.e.f. 1st April, 1997 as a part time sweeper and worked for 4½ years on payment of wages of Rs. 560 per month and he worked for 240 days compulsory service in every completed year and as per the departmental policy, the workman should have been regularized as a full time worker but the Party No.1 terminated his service illegally without following the due procedure of law and principles of natural justice and as such, the workman is entitled for reinstatement with continuity of service and back wages.

On the other hand, it was submitted by the learned advocate for the Party No.1 in the written notes of argument that though the workman filed the xerox copies of some documents in support of his claim of working as a part time sweeper, the same have not been proved and as such, cannot be taken into consideration and the workman has admitted in his cross-examination that he did not undergo

any recruitment process and there was no selection process as per the Recruitment Rules and he had never been appointed by the Party No.1 and at the most, he can be considered to be a daily wage casual labour, for which, he has been paid the daily wages at the relevant time and it is a settled law that such engagement does not confer any right on the workman, as laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of State of Karnataka Vs Umadevi and also in subsequent judgements and there was no master and servant relationship between the parties and the persons, who were in employment as casual workers as on 1-12-1996 have already been regularized and working for 240 days is not a sine quo none norm seeking regularization and there is no evidence to show that the workman had worked 240 days and the workman has failed to prove that he was engaged for 240 days continuously and as such, the workman is not entitled for any relief.

Taking into consideration the contentions raised by the learned advocates for the parties, it is to be considered as to whether the workman is entitled for any relief.

Though the workman has pleaded that he was working with the Party No.1 w.e.f. 1st April, 1997 and worked for 4 1/2 years continuously and worked for 240 days in each calendar year, he has not stated as to how he started working with Party No.1. On the other hand, though the Party No.1 has denied that the workman was never appointed by it, it appears from the trend of the cross-examination of the workman and the submission made by the learned advocate for the Party No.1 in the written notes of argument and the materials on record that the workman was working with the Party No.1 as a part time daily wager. So far placing reliance on the xerox copy of the documents produced by the workman is concerned, it is well settled that strict rules of Evidence Act are not applicable to the Tribunal. Moreover, the Party No.1 has denied the engagement of the workman in toto and did not produce the original documents. There is also no pleading from the side of the Party No.1 that the xerox copies are not genuine. Moreover, the said documents were also confronted to the witness examined on behalf of the Party No. 1. Hence, I think it proper to take the said documents into consideration, which are necessary for the just decision of the case. So far the documents, Ext.M-3 is concerned, the same is a list of the part time workers working with the Party No.1 as on 1-12-1996, though the claim of the workman is that he started working w.e.f. 1-4-1997. The list of part time workers as on 1-4-1997 has not been produced by the Party No.1 and as such, the document, Ext.M-3 is of no avail to the Party No. 1.

Though the workman has not specifically mentioned in his statement of claim that the mandatory provisions of Section 25-F of the Industrial Disputes Act were not complied with by Party No. 1, before termination of his

service, it is clear from his pleading that he has challenged his termination to be illegal on the ground of non-compliance of the provisions of Section 25- F of the Act. It is well settled that the onus to prove 240 days continuous service lies on the workman. Hence, it is to be find out as to whether, the workman has been able to show that he worked for 240 days preceding the 12 months of the date of termination of his service so as to attract the provision of Section 25- F of the Act.

The Xerox copies of the document No.1 filed by the workman show that he was engaged intermittently by the Party No.1 as a part time temporary daily wager w.e.f. 1-4-1997 to 30-9-2002 and he was paid wages ranging from Rs.10 to Rs. 20 per day according to the work done by him. It is found that for working 12 days in August, 98 for two hours per day, he was being paid at the rate of Rs. 10 per day. The said documents show that the claim of the workman that he was working with Party No.1 on payment of Rs. 560 per month is not true. It is also clear from the evidence on record that the engagement of the workman was purely temporary on daily wage basis and also intermittently as and when required and his engagement was not in accordance with the Recruitment Rules of the Party No.1 against any post and such engagement was according to the need of the work. It is found from the documents filed by the workman that he had not worked for 240 days preceding the 12 months from the date of termination of his service i.e. from 1-10-2002 and that he had not worked for 240 days in any calendar year. On calculation, it is found that the workman worked for 228 days preceding the 12 months from 1-10-2002 and he had worked for 121, 184, 175, 120, 155 and 184 days in the calendar years 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001 and 2002 respectively. There is no other evidence on record to show that the workman worked for 240 days preceding the 12 months from 1-10-2002. When the workman has failed to show that he had worked for 240 days preceding the 12 months from the date of his termination, there was no question of compliance of the provisions of Section 25-F of the Act. As the workman was a part-time temporary casual daily rated employee, he had or has no right to continue in service. In view of the discussions made above and the materials on record, it is found that the termination of the service by the Party No.1 is not illegal. Hence, it is ordered :

ORDER

The action of the management in relation to General Manager, BSNL, Chandrapur in terminating the services of Shri Vishvanath Ratan Mahatav, Ex-Sweeper by verbal order instead of regularization him in service as per the decasualization policy of the departmental is legal and justified and the workman is not entitled to any relief.

J. P. CHAND, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 17 फरवरी, 2011

का.आ. 742.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार नेशनल टेक्निकल रिसर्च ऑर्गेनाइजेशन के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोज्जकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय नं. 1, नई दिल्ली के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 11/2011) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 17-02-2011 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-42012/134/2010-आई आर(डीयू)]

डी. एस. एस. श्रीनिवास राव, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 17th February, 2011

S.O. 742.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 11/2011) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No. 1, New Delhi as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of National Technical Research Organisation and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 17-02-2011.

[No. L-42012/134/2010-IR(DU)]

D. S. S. SRINIVASA RAO, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE DR. R. K. YADAV, PRESIDING OFFICER,
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL
NO. 1, KARKARDOOMA COURTS COMPLEX,
DELHI**

I.D. No. 11/2011

Shri Amit Kumar S/o Shri Bacha Lal,
D/15/69, Sector-3, Rohini,
New Delhi—110 085

.....Claimant

Versus

The Director,
National Technical Research Organisation,
Block III, Old JNU Campus, Ber Sarai,
New Delhi—110 067

....Respondent

AWARD

National Technical Research Organisation (hereinafter referred to as the Organisation) primarily deals with providing technical intelligence to other agencies of internal and external security. It works under National Security Adviser, in the Office of Prime Minister of India. The Organisation is controlled by Research and Analysis Wing, Government of India, New Delhi. Functions performed by the Organisation are sovereign, which does not answer the definition of an 'industry' as contained in

clause (j) of Section 2 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (in short the Act).

2. Shri Amit Kumar was engaged as a peon by the Organisation on ad hoc basis. His period of employment was extended from time to time. Ultimately his services were dispensed with on 29-12-2008. He raised a dispute before the Conciliation Officer. His claim was resisted by the Organisation. When Conciliation proceedings failed, the Conciliation Officer submitted its report to the appropriate Government, as contemplated by sub-section (4) of Section 12 of the Act. On consideration of failure report, the appropriate Government referred the dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication, vide order No. L-42012/134/2010-IR (DU), New Delhi dated 21-12-2010, with following terms of reference:

"Whether the action of the management of Director, National Technical Research Organisation, New Delhi in terminating the services of Shri Amit Kumar w.e.f. 29-12-2008 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to?"

3. When notice was issued to the claimant to file his claim statement, he appeared before the Tribunal alongwith Shri Brijesh Tamber, his authorised representative. He made a statement on oath before the Tribunal, which is reproduced thus:

"I sought legal advice on my grievance from Shri Brijesh Tamber, my authorised representative. He advised me that National Technical Research Organisation, New Delhi performs sovereign functions for Government of India. Hence it is not an 'industry' within the meaning of clause (j) of Section 2 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. Since National Technical Research Organisation, New Delhi is not an 'industry' I have been advised that my grievance against Director, National Technical Research Organisation, New Delhi cannot take character of an industrial dispute. In view of legal advice so tendered. I am of the considered opinion that it would be a futile exercise to present my grievance before this Tribunal against Director, National Technical Research Organisation, New Delhi. Under these circumstances I present that filing of a claim statement for adjudication of my dispute would be futile exercise. Consequently, I opt not to file a claim statement in the matter. In view of my statement, reference may be answered."

4. As detailed above, claimant concedes that the Organization performs sovereign functions and is not an industry within the meaning of clause (j) of Section 2 of the Act. When Organisation is not an 'industry,' dispute between the claimant and the Organisation cannot take character of an industrial dispute, as defined under clause (k) of Section 2 of the Act. For sake of convenience the said definition is reproduced thus:

“industrial dispute” means any dispute or difference between employers and employees, or between employers and workmen, or between workmen and workmen, which is connected with the employment or non-employment or the terms of employment or with the conditions of labour, of any person.”

5. The definition of “Industrial dispute” referred above, can be divided into four parts, viz (i) factum of dispute, (2) parties to the dispute, viz. (a) employers and employees, (b) employer and workmen, or (c) workmen and workmen, (3) subject matter of the dispute, which should be connected with— (i) employment or non-employment, or (ii) terms of employment, or (iii) condition of labour of any person, and (4) it should relate to an “industry”.

6. The Organisation does not fall within the ambit of definition of word “industry”, which fact is conceded by the claimant. Hence, it is evident that the management is not an ‘industry’ and grievance between the claimant and the management cannot take the character of an industrial dispute. Consequently there was no jurisdiction available to the appropriate Government to refer the dispute to this Tribunal under clause (d) of sub section (1) of Section 10 of the Act. The reference so made is incompetent. In view of the findings recorded above, it is answered accordingly. Award, so passed, may be sent to the appropriate Government for publication.

Dr. R. K. YADAV, Presiding Officer

Dated: 08-02-2011

नई दिल्ली, 18 फरवरी, 2011

का.आ. 743.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार युनियन बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन के संबंधित नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, कानपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 71/1998) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 08-02-2011 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/390/96-आई आर (बी-II)]

रमेश सिंह, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th February, 2011

S.O. 743.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 71/1998) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/ Labour Court, Kanpur now as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Union Bank of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 08-02-2011.

[No. L-12012/390/96-IR (B-II)]

RAMESH SINGH, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE SRI RAM PARKASH, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, KANPUR

Industrial Dispute No. 71 of 98

BETWEEN

The Assistant General Secretary,
Union Bank Staff Association U.P.,
Central Office, 3/192, Viram Khand,
Gomti Nagar, Lucknow

AND

The General Manager,
Union Bank of India,
Shard Tower,
2nd Floor,
Kapoorthala Complex,
Aliganj, Lucknow

AWARD

1. Central Government, MoL, New Delhi, vide Notification No. L-12012/390/96-IR(B-II) dated 23-04-98, has referred the following dispute for adjudication to this tribunal—
2. Whether the action of the management of Union Bank of India imposing the punishment of stoppage of increments etc. upon Sri J. S. Giri is legal and justified? If not to what relief the said workman is entitled?
3. Brief facts are that it is an admitted fact that Sri J. S. Giri, Head Cashier Category C, of Chandeshwar Branch District Azamgarh was appointed by the bank in the subordinate cadre and was later on promoted to clerical cadre. It is stated that during 1992 Sri Anil Kumar Kalra was the branch manager of the branch. He was devising the ways and means to get himself transferred back to his native place. Sri Kalra was a pro-minority union officer of the bank and Sri Kalra was very much annoyed and prejudice against the workman due to trade union activities of the workman. Due to this he had been trying to malign and ruin him. On 12-11-92 without any cause or provocation, Kalra in furtherance of his object to malign him mischievously lodged a false FIR at Sidhari Police Station. In flagrant violation of the provisions contained in BPS the management issued a charge sheet dated 26-04-93 belatedly. The said charge sheet was issued by someone sitting in industry relation department Central Office Bombay without disclosing his identity sans due and proper authority from the Chief Executive Officer. By the said charge sheet Sri R. S. Bisht Manager Zonal Inquiry Cell, Lucknow was unauthorizedly and illegally appointed as inquiry officer. The inquiry

officer conducted the inquiry in haste he has mischievously fixed the dates due to which the workman could not defend properly. Sri Bisht unauthorizedly and illegally acted as inquiry officer-cum-disciplinary authority and gave his initial finding vide memorandum dated 4-4-94 proposing the punishment of stoppage of one annual increment. Thereafter Sri Bisht unfairly unauthorizedly imposed the punishment of stoppage of one future increment for one year and past increment which fell due during the period of suspension but for suspension, permanently vide memorandum dated 12-4-94. Applicant being aggrieved preferred an appeal which was rejected without assigning any reason. It is also stated that the management has lodged a false FIR and he was tried by the criminal court, wherein he was found not guilty and acquitted by the court.

4. Claimant has alleged that the order of the disciplinary authority is without authority. He has alleged that the charge sheet was issued with closed mind. He has also alleged that there is a violation of principle of natural justice. Finding of the inquiry officer are perverse and unreasoned. There is a basic error in the finding of inquiry officer and the order passed by him. It is also stated that on one count two punishment cannot be imposed. Opposite party has committed double jeopardy. Thus the entire proceedings have been vitiated for want of good faith, commission of victimization and violation of settled law on disciplinary action. Therefore, he has prayed that the inquiry be held as vitiated. The order of the disciplinary authority and the appellate authority be set aside and other relief be granted.
5. Opposite party has filed the written statement refuting the allegations of the claimant. It is stated that no cause of action has arisen to the claimant on facts and law. Present reference made by the government is in operative and bad in the eye of law. It is alleged that Sri J. S. Giri has committed misconduct as alleged in Para 7 of the written statement i.e. while on leave he visited the branch and attacked the branch manager under the influence of liquor. He committed other acts as mentioned in Para 7 of the reply. The matter was also reported to the police. Management imitated disciplinary proceedings and issued charge sheet as mentioned in para 9 of the reply mentioning therein gross as well as minor misconducts. The inquiry officer was appointed who conducted the inquiry. The management witnesses were examined and also cross examined by the employee in defence. Claimant was provided full opportunity for his defence. He has also produced the witnesses in his defence. He also submitted his written submission of defence

along with written argument. Thereafter the inquiry officer completed and gave his findings as stated in Para 12 that is accordingly I hold Sri Giri guilty of the following charges.

Riotous and indecent behavior on the premises of the bank and creating nuisance in the premises of the bank.

6. Since the charges were of grave nature, I propose to impose upon Sri Giri punishment of stoppage of one annual graded increment with cumulative effect. He will however be given personal hearing on 11-4-94. E.O. gave the claimant a personal hearing. Accordingly the following order was passed. The punishment of stoppage of one annual increment for a period of one year only that is without cumulative effect be and is hereby imposed upon Sri Giri. It was also ordered that he will not be entitled to any pay increment etc. for the period of suspension. Sri Giri made an appeal which was found without force and rejected. It is admitted that the claimant has filed the dispute before the ALC and later on reference was made. Other pleadings regarding procedure adopted by the inquiry during the course of disciplinary action has vehemently being contradicted by stating that the inquiry held against the claimant was held in accordance with the rules of natural justice and rules governing the service conditions and there is no infirmity in either in the inquiry proceedings or in the finding of the inquiry officer or in the final and appellate order. On these grounds it has been prayed the claim is devoid of merit and is liable to be rejected.
7. Rejoinder has also been filed by the claimant but nothing now has been stated there in except reiterating the facts as pleaded by him in his claim statement.
8. Both the parties have filed documentary as evidence in support of their respective claims and counter claims. No oral evidence has been adduced by either of the parties.
9. Heard and perused the record. There is no dispute regarding the issuance of the documents by the management to the claimant. So I do not find any need to refer each and every document of the contesting parties.
10. Claimant has filed 5 documents vide list 24-12-01. Claimant has also filed documents vide list dated 08-07-08.
11. Opposite party has also filed 7 documents vide list 9/1.
12. The authorized representative of the workman has not raised any contention before me regarding the malafide conducted by the inquiry officer. Moreover he has not adduced any evidence regarding the

malafide conducted by the opposite party. He has only challenged the legality proprietary of authority who had issued the charge sheet conducted the inquiry and passed the final orders.

13. He has drawn my attention towards the charge sheet. It is paper no. 30/1 admitted by both the parties. It is issued on 26-04-93. It is true that there is no designation of the disciplinary authority, who has issued the charge sheet. It shows that someone sitting in the Industrial Relation Department in the Union bank of India has issued the charge sheet as alleged by the claimant. What is reported in this charge sheet is it is mentioned that the inquiry into the charges levelled against workman will be held by Sri R. S. Bisht, Manager Enquiry Cell Zonal Office, Lucknow, dates etc., will be intimated by the inquiry officer.
14. Now after inquiry Sri R. S. Bisht who was appointed as enquiry officer has issued punishment order also assuming himself inquiry officer as well as disciplinary authority. This order was passed on 12-4-94. This is paper no. 30/30. This is also admitted by both the parties.
15. It is a simple question when a charge sheet has been issued by the disciplinary authority who is someone else then the inquiry officer, then how an inquiry officer Sri Bisht can assume the powers of the disciplinary authority also. There is no such order on the file which empowers Sri R. S. Bisht to be the inquiry officer as well as disciplinary authority.
16. Moreover the authorized representative has drawn my attention towards the provisions of the BPS which describe disciplinary action and procedure thereof. It states that clause 19.14 of 1st BPS—have been modified as under—

The Chief Executive Officer or the principal officer in India of a bank..... or principal officer nominated by him for the purpose shall decide which officer that is the disciplinary authority shall be empowered to take disciplinary action in the case of office or establishment..... These authorities shall be nominated by designation, to pass original order or hear and dispose of appeals from time to time shall be published from time to time on the banks notice board. It is clarified that the disciplinary authority may conduct the inquiry himself or appoint another officer as inquiry officer for the purpose of conducting the inquiry.
17. Therefore, in this case R. S. Bisht was simply appointed as inquiry officer by the disciplinary authority. Though in this case while issuing charge sheet disciplinary authority has also not disclosed his designation. In this way the charge sheet also stands to be vitiated. Therefore, it is also found that

the punishment has not been issued by an authorized authority.

18. Therefore, when the charge sheet and the order of punishment stands vitiated then the appeal would also stand vitiated. As such the order punishment imposed on the claimant is not found to be legal and justified.
19. Opposite party has given one ruling FLR (29) 195 VK Raj Industries v. Labour Court (All). I have gone through this ruling carefully and find that on the facts of the present case the law cited by the Hon'ble High Court, Allahabad is not applicable to the present case.
20. In view of above discussions it is held that the action of the management as referred to in the schedule of reference order is found to be neither legal nor just. Accordingly the punishment order as well as appellate order is hereby set aside and the claimant would be entitled for one increment on the premises as if he had not been awarded any punishment.
21. Reference is answered accordingly.

RAM PARKASH, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 18 फरवरी, 2011

का.आ. 744.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार आन्ध्रा बैंक के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 94/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 9-2-2011 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/75/2004-आई आर(बी-II)]

रमेश सिंह, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th February, 2011

S.O. 744.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No.94/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Hyderabad now as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Andhra Bank and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 9-2-2011.

[No. L-12012/75/2004-IR (B-II)]

RAMESH SINGH, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT
AT HYDERABAD

Present : Shri Ved Prakash Gaur, Presiding Officer

Dated the 11th day of January, 2011

Industrial Dispute No. 94/2004**BETWEEN:**

Sri Prabhudas,
D.No. 59.11.8/1, P&T Colony,
Rajahmundry, East Godavari Dist.Petitioner

AND

The Deputy General Manager,
Andhra Bank, Zonal Office,
Personnel Department,
Dr. Joga Rao Complex,
Opp. Town Hall, Kakinada,
East Godavari district Respondent

APPEARANCES:

For the Petitioner : Sri P. Prabhudas, Party in person

For the Respondent : M/s. S. Udayachala Rao, S.
Vikramaditya Babu, S. Mujib
Kumar & S.T. Ramani, Advocates

AWARD

This reference has been received from Government of India, Ministry of Labour by its order No. L-12012-75-2004-IR(B-II) dated 28-6-2004 under Section 10(1) (d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 to resolve the dispute between the workman Sri Prabhu Das, Ex-Clerk(Cashier), Vadisaleru branch and the management of Andhra Bank. The term of reference is as under :

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of management of Andhra Bank, Zonal Office, Kakinada in terminating the services of Shri Prabhu Das, Ex. Clerk (Cashier), Vadisaleru Branch by way of compulsory retirement w.e.f. 1-9-2002 is legal and justified? If not, what relief the concerned workman is entitled to?”

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as I.D.No. 94/2004 and notices were issued to the parties.

2. Petitioner filed claim statement stating therein that he joined Andhra Bank in the year 1986 as Clerk. He put in 16 years of the service but unfortunately he was implicated in some false and untenable charges. Charge sheet dated 9-12-1999 was issued to him calling for his explanation to which he replied. 14 charges were levelled against him. Not satisfied with the explanation of the Petitioner enquiry was ordered. The Enquiry Officer acted as an agent of the second Respondent and submitted his report holding the Petitioner workman as guilty of the charges. After receiving the enquiry report, second Respondent ordered imposing the punishment of compulsory retirement on 31-7-2002, against which Petitioner submitted his representation dated 31-8-2002 and sought for personal hearing through the letter dated 7-10-2002. Petitioner was advised to attend the personal hearing on 19-3-2002. However, no letter was sent to the Petitioner for attending personal hearing.

Appeal was filed by the Petitioner which was rejected by the Appellate Authority on 31-10-2002. The Petitioner has categorically challenged the finding of the Enquiry Officer. The Petitioner contended that he raised the objection as to non-availability of the document produced by the management which was ignored by the Enquiry Officer. The enquiry report was not supplied to the Petitioner. The documents relied upon by the management was also not supplied to the Petitioner. That the enquiry conducted by the management is vitiated, the Petitioner was instructed to sign the register. No financial loss was caused by the Petitioner to the bank no financial irregularities were committed by the Petitioner. All the actions done by the Petitioner in good faith and in accordance with the instructions by the superiors. It has been alleged that for day to day transactions superior officers including the Branch Manager, would not pass any written orders. Thus, any denial by first Respondent in this regard would be nothing but to make the Petitioner workman liable to the charges.

3. The Petitioner has submitted that he deposited the alleged amount as the first Respondent assured the Petitioner that no problem would arise. Assuming but not admitting the charges are levelled against him to be true, the bank ought to have followed reformatory approach while imposing the punishment of compulsory retirement. It has not been proved during the enquiry proceeding that any pecuniary loss has been caused by the Petitioner. The enquiry is bad in law. Thus, the order passed on basis of enquiry report is also bad in the eye of law. The principles of natural justice had not been followed. The Petitioner has approached Assistant Labour Commissioner (C). Visakhapatnam, conciliation proceeding was started but ended in failure. The Petitioner was not informed regarding the failure report to the Government of India, he approached Hon'ble High Court of A.P., Hyderabad and thus, the matter was finally referred to this tribunal.

4. Respondent management has filed counter statement wherein they have denied the charges that Enquiry Officer has acted as an agent of the management. Petitioner's contention that he was not informed for the personal hearing is incorrect. He was informed regarding the personal hearing but he did not prefer to appear before the concerned officer. His appeal was rejected on the cogent reasons and grounds. During course of the enquiry necessary documents were supplied to him which were visible and readable. The Petitioner workman has misappropriated the funds of the bank. He himself has deposited the misappropriated amount which prove that the Petitioner has intentionally misappropriated bank's money. He has misappropriated the amounts received from the customers, he has falsified the amount of the bank register and records of the bank. He was chargesheeted and explanation was sought from him to which he filed his explanation which was not satisfactory,

hence enquiry was ordered to be held by competent officer. The petitioner workman participated in the enquiry. After conclusion of the enquiry, the Enquiry Officer submitted his report proving all the charges levelled against the Petitioner as proved on the basis of which the Petitioner was punished with compulsory retirement punishment which is neither excessive nor disproportionate.

5. The Enquiry Officer has not acted as an agent of the management. He has followed the principles of natural justice. There is no force in the claim petition and it deserves to be dismissed.

6. Parties were given opportunity to produce their evidence. Respondent bank has filed the enquiry proceeding containing entire record coupled with the reply, charge sheet, evidence collected during course of enquiry and evidence adduced before the Enquiry Officer. The Petitioner has filed and relied upon the papers 11 documents, letter No. 666/20/V/P-326/615 dated 13-10-2002, letter No. 677/20/1654 dated 31-7-2002, appeal of Petitioner dated 7-10-2002 letter dated 17-9-2002 of Respondent No. 2 by registered post acknowledgement due to the Petitioner informing him that he has not attended for personal hearing on 19-3-2002, letter dated 'nil' of Petitioner to Respondent bank, another letter dated 24-12-2001 regarding finding of the Enquiry Officer.

7. Domestic enquiry was conducted in this case before imposition of the punishment on delinquent employee i.e. the present Petitioner, hence, the question of legality and validity of the domestic enquiry was considered before hearing the parties on merits of the case and on hearing the parties regarding legality and validity of domestic enquiry, it was held by this tribunal on 23-7-2009 that domestic enquiry was legal and valid. Hence, the question of legality and otherwise of domestic enquiry can not be reiterated at this stage.

8. I have heard both the parties counsels under Sec. 11A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, both of them filed their written arguments as well which has been considered by me.

9. This tribunal has to consider the following points for determination:

(I) Whether the action of management of Andhra Bank, Kakinada in terminating the services of Sri Prabhu Das, Ex-Clerk (Cashier), Vadisaleru branch by way of compulsory retirement w.e.f. 1-9-2002 is legal and justified?

(II) Whether the workman is entitled for any relief? If so, to what relief?

10. **Point No. (I) :** In the present case the question of the appointment of the Petitioner in the year 1986 is not disputed. It is also not disputed that the Petitioner has worked for more than 16 years. It is also not disputed between the parties that charge sheet dated 9-12-1999 was served on the Petitioner workman levelling 14 charges

against the Petitioner. The copy of the charge sheet is available on this record. It is also not disputed between the parties that the Petitioner was asked to submit his explanation regarding the charges levelled against him and Petitioner has submitted his explanation before the competent authority. It would be relevant to mention the article of charges in the present case to evaluate the gravity of the misconduct in the matter of the Petitioner workman. Charge No. 1, it was alleged that while working as Joint custodian cashier at Vadisaleru branch the Petitioner has committed certain acts of gross misconduct in performing the duties as cashier and joint custodian of cash/gold ornaments/documents of loans of the branch such as: (a) misappropriation of bank funds, (b) falsification of bank records, such as not accounting monies received, not entering the debit transactions in the ledger, realization of the security charge to the bank, (c) release of securities funds of the bank in collusion with Mr. N. Jayaraju, officer of the bank and in the process diluting securities cover and exposing the bank to a financial risk. You have failed to discharge your duty with utmost integrity, honesty, diligence and devotion. The acts committed by you are prejudicial to the interests of the bank and constituted gross misconduct under para 19.5(j) of Bipartite Settlement. The charges consist of following allegations against the Petitioner workman:

"1. That you are maintaining the savings bank account No. 3 in your name with Vadisaleru branch. You have prepared, signed and presented a withdrawal for Rs. 7500 from your account on 18-9-98 while the account was showing a credit balance of Rs. 31.01 ps only. You have posted the debit entry in the ledger sheet of your account leaving a line gap between the outstanding balance column and debit entry without striking the balance and also posted the debit transaction in the sub ledger cum sub daybook. Mr. N. Jayaraju has passed the withdrawal for payment though entries were not made in the SB ledger and though there was no balance in the account and thus, you have drawn an amount of Rs. 7500 from the bank in a fraudulent manner.

2. You have remitted Rs. 7550 in your SB A/c No. 3 on 28-9-98, preparing the credit challan in your hand writing. You have gap left while drawing Rs. 7500 on 18-9-98 in order to give an impression that the credit was posted earlier to the debit entry of Rs. 7500 of 18-9-98 and arrived at the final balance of Rs. 81.01 ps. You have also posted the said entry in the sub-day book cum sub-ledger on 28-9-98. Mr. N. Jayaraju, officer has colluded with you and initialed the credit challan, but did not subscribe his initial in the ledger sheet, in order to adjust the amount of Rs. 7500 fraudulently withdrawn by you on 18-9-98.

3. You have posted in your own hand writing a fictitious credit entry of Rs. 16000 in the SB A/c No. 1673 maintained at the branch in the joint names of yourself and your wife, Smt. S S Shanta Kumari, without noting the

date and struck the balance as Rs. 16012.70 ps. However, you did not post the fictitious credit entry of Rs. 16000 in the subledger cum subdaybook. On 9-10-98, you have posted a withdrawal of Rs. 15500, prepared and signed by you duly striking a balance of Rs. 512.70 ps. You have entered the debit transaction of Rs. 15,500 in the sub-ledger cum sub-day book. Mr. N. Jayaraju, the counter officer of of your branch, passed the withdrawal for payment and you have drawn the amount of Rs. 15,500 fraudulently.

4. You have presented a withdrawal of Rs. 400 in your SB A/c No. 1673 on 16-10-1998 duly prepared and signed by you. You have posted the debit entry in the ledger sheet and also in the sub ledger cum sub day book. Manager, Mr. VRC Murthy has passed the withdrawal for payment and is sent the withdrawal along with payment scroll to you. You have received the same duly putting your initials in the payment scroll and noted the amount of payment for the withdrawal as Rs. 13400 and subsequently changed to Rs. 14400 in the rough chitta. You have altered the amount of withdrawal in figures and words from Rs. 400 to Rs. 14400. You have also altered the figures in the payment scroll and subledger cum sub day book to tally the books. Thus, you have withdrawal the amount of Rs. 14000 fraudulently, by altering the amount from Rs. 400 to Rs. 14400. After the fraud came into light, you have on 20-10-98, brought and presented two withdrawal for Rs. 16000 and Rs. 14000 dated 30-9-98 and 16-10-98 respectively, issued by Mrs. K. Seetharatnam holder of SB A/c N. 1806 in favour of Mrs. SS Shanta Kumari, along with two credit challans on 20-10-1998 for the credit of SB 1673. Mr. VRC Murthy, the Manager kept these amounts in Sundry Suspense account duly noting the date as 20-10-98 for the credit of SB 1673. Thus, you have temporarily misappropriated the bank's funds to the tune of Rs. 29,900 in the SB A/c 1673, in a fraudulently manner and made good of the amount when the fraud has come to light.

5. You have misappropriated an amount of Rs. 5900 received from one Mrs. M. Rama Tulasi, who has paid the amount towards the Deposit loan account No. 97/148 (against KTD 97/144) without releasing the credit voucher which was prepared by you. In collusion with Mr. N. Jayaraju, the Joint Custodian officer of the branch, you have delivered the deposit receipt KTD 97/144 to Mrs. Rama Tulasi by obtaining her thumb impression in the concerned folio of the deposit loan account. When inspection of the deposit loan documents took place in the branch, the deposit receipt KTD 97/144 was found missing and the deposit loan No. 97/148 against the said deposit was found outstanding. You have accepted that you have misappropriated the amount of Rs. 5900 paid by Mrs. M. Rama Tulasi and remitted an amount of Rs. 5811 on 22-10-98 to the credit of Sundry Suspense account towards the said deposit loan amount duly signing on the reverse of the credit voucher. Thus, you have

misappropriated the bank's funds to the tune of Rs. 5811 and exposed the bank to financial risk.

6. You have colluded with Mr. N. Jayaraju and misappropriated an amount of Rs. 6212 on 17-8-98 paid by one Mrs. B. Varalakshmi to the credit of her deposit loan No. 98/Ag/45, while she obtained another deposit loan bearing No. 98/Ag/82 for Rs. 9000. She was paid by you an amount of Rs. 2788 only after adjustment of credit voucher for Rs. 6212 towards closure of earlier DL. No. 98/Ag/45. You did not enter this cash receipt of Rs. 6212 in your rough chitta and accordingly the voucher was not sent to the cash officer. You have delivered the deposit receipt No. KTD 98/43 to Mrs. B. Varalakshmi. During the course of inspection of your branch you have accepted misappropriation of Rs. 6212 and remitted Rs. 6374 towards closure of DL No. 98/Ag/45, to the credit of Sundry Suspense account on 22-10-98 duly signing on the reverse of the credit voucher. Thus, you have misappropriated the amount of Rs. 6212 from 17-8-98 to 22-10-98, while exposing the bank to financial risk of Rs. 6212.

7. On 20-10-1998, during the course of inspection of gold ornaments relating to the gold loan accounts of the branch under the joint custody of yourself and Mr. N. Jayaraju, officer of the branch, it was observed that the gold ornaments relating to the gold loan account 99/44 in your name were missing. You have remitted an amount of Rs. 24124 on 20-10-98 under cash scroll item No. 19 towards the repayment of gold loan account 99/44, though it was shown in the books/records as if the payment for the loan account was received on 17-10-98 in late cash and the ornaments were delivered. You have thus released the gold ornaments pledged to the bank under Gold loan 99/44 without bank actually receiving the cash towards full settlement. You have thus, temporarily misappropriated the bank's funds to the tune of Rs. 24124 and exposed the bank to a possible financial risk.

8. You have colluded with Mr. N. Jayaraju and misappropriated an amount of Rs. 8780 on 6-10-98 which was paid by Mr. Bh. Satyanarayana Raju to the credit of his gold loan No. 98/148 out of his new gold loan No. 98/246 for Rs. 13,500 and delivered the ornaments without remitting the amount in the Bank's account and also not noted the same in rough chitta. You have noted the cash adjustment related to this transaction on the last page of the rough chitta as follows:

13,500.00	4,720
<u>8,780.00</u>	<u>8,780</u>
4,720.00	13,500

You have adjusted the misappropriated amount of Rs. 8780 on 20-10-98 using the voucher which was signed by Mr. Bh. Satyanarayana Raju on 6-10-1998. Thus, you have misappropriated the bank's funds for your pecuniary gains which is prejudicial to the interests of the Bank.

9. You have misappropriated the amount remitted by Mr. Alamanda Vishnu towards closure of his gold loan number 97/295 during May, 1998 and delivered the ornaments without obtaining the acknowledgment from the borrower in collusion with Mr. N. Jayaraju, officer has remitted an amount of Rs. 4513 on 20-10-1998 for closure of the loan account and you have accepted the cash receipt as cashier of the branch. Though the credit voucher was bearing a thumb impression without indicating the name, the borrower vide his letter dated 22-10-1998 has confirmed in writing that he has not come to the bank on 20-10-1998. You have thus allowed release of ornaments pledged to the bank without the loan account having been closed, temporarily misappropriated the amount remitted by Sri A. Vishnu (for closure of gold loan account) in collusion with Mr. N. Jayaraju.

10. You have colluded with Mr. N. Jayaraju and misappropriated the amount remitted by Mrs. Panduri Papa towards closure of her Gold loan No. 98/6 during October, 1998 and delivered the ornaments without obtaining the acknowledgement from the borrower and without the account having been closed in the bank's books. During the course of inspection of the branch, the fraud came into light and Mr. N. Jayaraju, officer has prepared the voucher and remitted an amount of Rs. 2910 on 20-10-98 for closure of the loan account. Though the credit voucher was bearing a thumb impression without indicating the name, the borrower vide his letter dated 22-10-98 has confirmed in writing that he has not come to the bank on 20-10-98 and taken delivery of the ornaments about 5 months back by remitting the amount to you. Thus, you have misappropriated the amount.

11. In collusion with Mr. N. Jayaraju, you have misappropriated the amount remitted by one Mr. Uppalapati Satyanarayana towards closure of his gold loan No. 98/178 on 20-8-98 and delivered the ornaments to the borrower. Amount so paid by the borrower is not

remitted into the bank by you. During the course of the inspection of the branch, the fraud came to light, you and Mr. N. Jayaraju, officer have confirmed in the ornaments register that the ornaments were released by you jointly. You have accepted the misappropriation and remitted an amount of Rs. 5187 under your signature on 22-10-98 to the credit of Sundry suspense account being the amount misappropriated by you.

12. You have misappropriated an amount of Rs. 7979.50 ps remitted by Mr. Kalvapalli Subba Rao towards closure of his gold loan No. 98/66 on 17-10-98 and delivered the ornaments to the borrower. Amount so paid by the borrower is not remitted into the bank by you. During the course of inspection of the branch, the fraud came into light, you and Mr. N. Jayaraju, the joint custodian officer have confirmed in the ornaments register that the ornaments are not available. You have accepted the misappropriation and remitted an amount of Rs. 7938 under your signature on 22-10-98 to the credit of sundry suspense account being the amount misappropriated by you.

13. You have prepared a debit voucher for Rs. 13000 dated 21-9-98 in your own hand writing without actually debiting to Sulabha SOD account No. 96/9, standing in your name, you have put your initials and noted the ledger folio No. on the debit voucher in token of having posted the entry in the ledger. Mr. N. Jayaraju has authorized the voucher for payment and you have withdrawn the amount. Thus, you have fraudulently drawn and misappropriated an amount of Rs. 13000 in collusion with Mr. Jayaraju, officer.

14. You have issued following cheques to Chit Fund companies and others. You in collusion with Mr. N. Jayaraju, the officer misused your official position and have kept the cheques pending, without entering in the Inward Bills register, till you remitted the cash in your ASB a/c No.2 to meet the funds to pass the cheques received from outstations.

S. No.	IBR No.	Cheque No. & Date	Amount (Rs.)	Payee	Received from	Entered/ Passed
Mr. S. Prabhudas:						
1.	39	851858 16-6-98	5000	J. Karunakar	Thokada Br.	29-7-98
2.	32	851860 18-6-98	5000	S. Daya Samson	Devi Chowk	29-6-98
3.	Not entered	85176 7-2-98	2335	Satya Chits	Ramaraopet	28-2-98
4.	Not entered	851767 15-2-98	2450	Sriram Chits	Rajahmundry	13-3-98
5.	12	851768 24-3-98	838	Sriram Chits	Ramaraopet	23-4-98
6.	11	851769 24-3-98	317	Sriram Chits	KVB Ltd. (Rangireejupet, RJY)	20-4-98
7.	Not entered	851895 12-8-98	2500	V.N. Rao	Rangampet	10-9-98
8.	Not entered	851894 15-8-98	2553	Satya Chits	Ramaraopet	13-10-98
9.	54	851900 26-9-98	1455	Sriram Chits	KVB Ltd. (Rangireejupet, RJY)	30-10-98

These charges were read over to the workman during course of the enquiry to which he has denied. Then, Presenting Officer has produced the documents and management witnesses. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner workman has drawn the attention of this tribunal towards the statement of MW1 at page 121 wherein the MW1 has stated that joint custodian is not initiating for release of documents. He has further stated that clerk who is acting as joint custodian is not responsible for pledge and release of documents pertaining to the advances. It was asked from the MW1 that when the clerk is not responsible for the pledge and release of the documents of advances of what circumstances made you to obtain MEX-30, 45, 49, 55, 69? To this question, MW1 has replied that "when the documents are not available with the branch and loans are outstanding I enquired the parties. They have given the statements." To another question that whether the CSE is responsible for missing of the documents, MW1 has said that CSE is not responsible for missing of the documents. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner had argued that the statement of MW1 has not been considered in right prospective by the Enquiry Officer because the statement of MW1 proved that the Petitioner was not responsible for initiating, release of the documents nor he was responsible for missing of the documents. But apart from the evidence of MW1 there are other witnesses and other material evidence available on the record and MEX-30, 45, 49, 55 and 69, statement of the concerned persons which may go to prove that though the Petitioner was not sole responsible for the pledge of the documents or the release of the documents he was joint custodian along with Mr. Jayaraju which has been argued by the Learned Counsel for the Respondent that the Petitioner was not only charged with release of the pledged articles and documents only but he was charged with his personal and unlawful gain from the bank's money.

11. Learned Counsel for the Respondent has argued that the Petitioner has withdrawn a sum of Rs. 7500 from his own bank account No. 3 on 18-9-98 when there is a credit balance of Rs. 31.01 ps in his account. He did not filled the ledger outstanding balance column and debit transactions etc., in sub day book. Thus, he fraudulently withdrew a sum of Rs. 7500 from his own account, which he has opened in the bank itself. The said amount was deposited by the enquiry proceeding workman when it came to the light and knowledge of the officer. Not only that, he remitted Rs. 7550 in his savings bank account No. 3 on 28-9-98 preparing credit challan in his own handwriting posted the entry in ledger sheet without noting the date in the gap left while drawing Rs. 7500 on 18-9-98 in order to give an impression that credit was posted earlier to the debit entry of Rs. 7500 of 18-9-98 and arrived at final balance of Rs. 81.01 ps. The workman has posted the said entry in sub day book of sub ledger on 28-9-98 in collusion with Mr. Jayaraju. He has further argued that the Petitioner

workman has posted in his own hand writing a fictitious credit entry of Rs. 16000 in SB A/c No. 1673 maintained at the branch in the joint name of Petitioner workman and his wife Smt. S.S. Santha Kumari, without noting date and struck the balance as Rs. 16012.70 ps. However, he did not post the fictitious credit entry of Rs. 16000 in the sub-ledger-cum-sub day book. On 9-10-98 he posted a withdrawal of Rs. 15500 in the sub ledger-cum-sub day book. Mr. N. Jayaraju, counter officer of the branch passed the withdrawal for payment and workman has drawn the amount of Rs. 15500 fraudulently.

12. Learned Counsel for Respondent further argued that the Petitioner has withdrawn a sum of Rs. 400 in account No. 1673 on 16-10-98, duly prepared and signed by Petitioner workman himself. He has posted the debit entry in the ledger sheet and also in the sub ledger-cum sub day book. Mr. V.R.C. Murthy has passed the withdrawal for the payment and has signed withdrawal along with payment scroll of Petitioner workman. The said amount was received by the Petitioner himself duly putting his initials in the payment scroll and noting the amount of payment for the withdrawal of Rs. 13400 and subsequently changed to Rs. 14400 in rough chitta. The Petitioner has altered the amount of withdrawal in figure and words from Rs. 400 to Rs. 14400 and has also altered the figure in the payment scroll and sub-ledger-cum-sub day book to tally the books. Thus, he has withdrawn an amount of Rs. 14000 fraudulently by altering the amount from Rs. 400 to Rs. 14400. After the fraud came to light he has on 20-10-98 brought and presented two withdrawals for Rs. 16000 and Rs. 14000 dated 30-9-98 and 16-10-98 issued by Mrs. K. Seetharatnam holder of account No. 1806 in favour of Mrs. S. S. Santha Kumari, along with two credit challans on 20-10-98 for the credit of SB A/c No. 1673. The amount was kept in suspense account thus, he has temporarily embezzled or misappropriated the bank's amount of Rs. 29900.

13. He has further argued that the Petitioner workman in his own petition in para 9, admitted that he deposited the alleged amount as the first Respondent assured him that no problem would arise. This prove that the Petitioner has not only admitted this fraudulent activities and temporary misappropriation of the bank's funds during the course of the enquiry proceeding but through his claim statement also he has admitted that he deposited the amount on the assurance of the Respondent No. 1 that no action will be taken and no problem would arise. This prove that the Petitioner workman was guilty of fraud and misappropriation, as such, the statement of MW1 that the Petitioner workman was not responsible for the missing of the documents or the pledge and release of the documents for the transactions will not make any difference towards misconduct committed by the Petitioner workman. The Petitioner workman has committed the misconduct or misappropriation of the funds by withdrawing the bank

funds without having any credit balance in his own account taking advantage of his position as the clerk and cashier of the bank. Thus, the Petitioner workman has committed the gross misconduct or grave misconduct which attract the punishment of removal from service. The bank authority has taken lenient view in the matter of the Petitioner and inspite of dismissing the Petitioner from the services he has been ordered to be compulsorily retired from the services.

14. I have considered the above arguments. in the light of the admission of the Petitioner workman in para 9 of his own claim statement. wherein he has alleged that "I deposited the alleged amount as first Respondent has assured of no problem." And charges levelled against him are true, the bank ought to have held reformatory approach. I have considered this argument of the Petitioner workman. But the misconduct committed by the Petitioner is of very serious nature. The Petitioner has misappropriated the fund of the bank and thus he has lost his credibility and faith of the management. In those circumstances, the question of taking reformatory approach was not a proper and sufficient punishment in the present case.

15. The Petitioner workman has intentionally and knowingly being clerk and cashier of the bank has misappropriated the bank's fund. Though he has refunded the amount after it came into the light of the higher authorities but the refund of the amount will not dilute the gravity of the offence committed by the Petitioner workman. Thus, to my mind the action of the management of Andhra Bank in terminating the services of Sri S. Prabhudas. clerk (Cashier) by way of compulsory retirement is legal and justified.

16. Point No. (II) : The action of the management is legal and justified. Petitioner has committed serious offence of misappropriation of the bank's fund as such, the punishment of compulsory retirement imposed on the workman is neither disproportionate nor excessive. It is the only proper punishment and Petitioner is not entitled for any relief. Point No. (II) is decided accordingly.

17. From the above discussion, the reference is decided as such and the action of the management of Andhra Bank is held to be legal and justified and workman is not entitled for any relief, hence, this award.

Award passed accordingly, Transmit.

Dictated to Smt. P. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant transcribed by her corrected by me on this the 11th day of January, 2011.

VED PRAKASH GAUR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for
the Petitioner

NIL

Witnesses examined for
the Respondent

NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 18 फरवरी, 2011

का.आ. 745.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार आन्ध्र बैंक के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/अपम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या एल.सी. सं. 216/2004) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 17-02-2011 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-39025/1/2010-आई आर(बी-1)]

रमेश सिंह, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th February, 2011

S.O. 745.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No.L.C. No.216/2004) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal /Labour Court, Hyderabad now as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Andhra Bank and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 17-02-2011.

[No. L-39025/1/2010-IR (B-II)]

RAMESH SINGH, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

Present :- Shri Ved Prakash Gaur, Presiding Officer

Dated the 12th day of January, 2011

Industrial Dispute L.C. 216/2004

Between :

Sri P. Kamala Naik,

S/o Kunyanaik

C/o H. No. 39-112, Bandar Nagar,

Wanaparthi, Mahabubnagar District.

.....Petitioner

AND

1. The Deputy General Manager (Personnel)
Appellate Authority, Andhra Bank,
Head Office, Hyderabad.

2. The Chief Manager and Disciplinary Authority,
Zonal office, Andhra Bank,
Kurnool.

.....Respondents

APPEARANCES:

For the Petitioner : M/s. G. Vidya Sagar, K. Udaya
Sri P. Sudheer Rao & D.
Madhusuhan, Advocates

For the Respondent : M/s. S. Udayachala Rao, S.
Vikramaditya Babu & S. Mujib
Kumar, Advocates

AWARD

This petition under Sec. 2A (2) of the I.D. Act, 1947 was filed by Sri P. Kamala Naik, an ex-employee of Andhra Bank challenging the order of his termination from service dated 10-7-2003.

2. It has been alleged by the Petitioner workman that he joined the service of the bank as clerk at Birkuru branch, Nizamabad district as regular employee. He worked in various branches of the bank and was discharging his duties to the entire satisfaction of his superiors. While the Petitioner was discharging his duties at Wanaparthy branch he was issued with the charge sheet dated 20-3-2002 alleging therein that he committed misappropriation of amount, the charges were as follows :

a. You have availed a deposit loan of Rs. 30000 and further loan of Rs. 25000 on 7-7-2001 and 14-8-2001 respectively using closed deposit receipt favouring K. Janakamma by forging the signature of the deposit holder.

b. Again a deposit loan of Rs. 45,000 and further loan of Rs. 30000 was availed by you on 23-06-2001 and 10-8-2001 respectively against two deposits on which loan was already existing favouring V. Padmavathamma by forging the signature of the deposit holder by you.

c. Further, you have written a deposit loan debit voucher for Rs. 65000 on 25-7-2001 again the deposit of E. Padmamma without any application/deposit receipt. Also you have not noted any lien in the deposit register, which led to misappropriation of the above amount.

d. All the entries relating to the above transactions were prepared by you and the signatures of the deposit holders were forged by you in the accounts mentioned under serial numbers 1 and 2. Total amount involved in the three accounts is Rs. 1.95 lacks.

3. The Petitioner submitted his explanation denying that he has not availed any departmental loan by using closed deposit receipts of K. Janakamma because it is not possible to avail a deposit loan on closed deposit receipt because such receipts are kept in the custody of the officer. The Petitioner has acted on the instruction of Sri Ram Mohan Rao, officer who asked the Petitioner to fill deposit loan application and also asked him to write the name accordingly, the Petitioner has done at the instruction of his superior officer. He further stated that he has not availed any loan of Rs. 45000 and 30000 on deposit receipt on which there was already existing loans because such

deposit receipts are placed with the bank and same will be under the custody of the officer the Petitioner stated that Sri Ram Mohan Rao asked the Petitioner to fill the application accordingly the Petitioner has filled the application. Management was not satisfied with the reply of the Petitioner and ordered for an enquiry. During course of enquiry also Petitioner clearly stated that Sri Ram Mohan Rao has given receipt to the Petitioner and an application and he advised the Petitioner to write the debit voucher accordingly, Petitioner has wrote debit vouchers. There was no fault on the part of the Petitioner and he has followed the instructions of his superior. He further submitted before the Enquiry Officer that the deposit receipts were in the custody of officer as such, clerk can not draw loan on such receipts, and the amounts were credited by son of Mr. Ram Mohan Rao that reveals the fact that Mr. Ram Mohan Rao availed the said loans and as per his advise and instructions of said Mr. Ram Mohan Rao the Petitioner has acted. The Petitioner has stated that he belongs to Scheduled Tribe, he knew only to follow the instructions of his superiors. He was innocent and no witness is coming forward in support of Petitioner as he is a member of Scheduled Tribe group. Manager of the bank has also not cooperated with the Petitioner nor he could reveal the fact that son of Mr. Ram Mohan Rao is the remitter of loan, the Enquiry Officer has not considered this facts, nor he gave proper opportunity to cross examination the witness. Petitioner stated in the claim statement that in the course of enquiry he has stated the responsibilities and duties of the clerk, the clerk is not responsible for the custody of deposit receipts and its documents, as such, it is not possible to the Petitioner to avail loan on closed deposit receipts. Moreove, the writing of K. Janakamma was not sent for verification by bank on the application and the deposit receipts. The Petitioner is not guilty of any misappropriation. The Enquiry Officer has failed to appreciate the fact that closed deposit receipt is to be cancelled and be kept with the debit voucher of the deposit receipts at the time of closure. Deposits were closed on 9-3-2000 and that was not closed by the Petitioner. The deposit receipt is not cancelled hence, Petitioner could not be made liable. It was closed by another clerk and officer who has not cancelled the deposit receipt intentionally. After long gap of time the officer has taken that receipt and raised the said deposit loan mischevously and the same was repaid by him. The action against the Petitioner is arbitrary, illegal and unjust. The Petitioner has acted on the instruction of the superior who asked him to write debit voucher as a clerk, the Petitioner has simply obeyed to the instruction and prepared debit voucher but Petitioner is not authorized for debit voucher payment. The authority of the same vests in officer being link officer for the payment, this shows the mal intention of officer. The officer Mr. Ram Mohan Rao has deposited a sum of Rs. 1,90,000 and he has made good the loss caused to the bank, through his sons. As such, no financial loss has been caused to the bank.

Petitioner is not responsible for any of the misdeed, it was Mr. Ram Mohan Rao who has unnecessarily involved the Petitioner in the fraud committed by him as such, the order of termination against the Petitioner is unjust, illegal and deserves to be quashed.

4. Respondent has filed counter statement stating that Petitioner joined as clerk-cum-cashier 17-7-84, it has been alleged by the management that during period of probation the Petitioner was alleged to have misappropriated money deposited by customer and his services were terminated by proceeding dated 26-11-94. The Petitioner raised the industrial dispute through Andhra Bank Employees Union challenging the validity of the termination. Taking into consideration the social and economical background of the Petitioner a sympathetic view was taken by the management and it was decided to take him into service without any back wages, accordingly, a settlement was entered into by the bank during the conciliation proceedings before Assistant Labour Commissioner (C) on 30-1-1986 and Petitioner was reinstated into service by order dated 14-2-1986.

5. The Petitioner was again issued with a charge sheet dated 19-1-1994 for misconduct of misappropriation of the money of the customer while working at Yerupalem branch at Khammam district. After enquiry he was imposed with penalty of stoppage of 4 increments with cumulative effect. He did not prefer any appeal against the punishment order, thus, the penalty imposed attained finality.

6. The Petitioner was issued with another charge sheet dated 4-11-95 for availing LFC during the period 11-10-1994 to 4-11-1994 and submitted take bills as he did not perform journey. He was issued with another charge sheet dated 2-3-2001 for misappropriation of a sum of Rs. 14975 while working as Receipts Cashier at Wanaparthi branch, in which proceedings were closed after giving warning to him. It has further been alleged that many minor punishment were awarded to the Petitioner as such, the averment of Petitioner that earlier services were unblemished is far from truth. While working as clerk-cum-cashier at Wanaparthi branch it is alleged that he has indulged in various serious omission and commissions pending investigation, he was placed under suspension w.e.f. 11-2-2002 and after thorough investigation he was charge sheeted vide order dated 28-3-2002 on which explanation was submitted by the Petitioner which was not found to be satisfactory, domestic enquiry was ordered to be conducted against the Petitioner, management has examined two witnesses and has produced 39 documents during course of enquiry as M Ex. 1 to M Ex. 39 and Petitioner has also produced five documents DEx. 1 to DEx. 5 but did not produce a single witness, he produced himself for evidence. He was afforded full and fair opportunity and after completion of the enquiry, the Enquiry Officer has concluded that the Petitioner has written all the vouchers

of deposit receipts, withdrawal forms and has signed himself. Though out of the amount withdrawn through bank an amount of Rs. 190000 has been deposit, the gravity of the misconduct can not be looked lightly. On the basis of the enquiry report the management has ordered dismissal from service, as the Petitioner has lost faith and confidence of the management and continuance of such employees will certainly shake the very foundation of the institution, as such, the punishment can not be said to be disproportionate or excessive. Petition is devoid of merit and fit to be dismissed.

7. Parties were directed to produce their respective evidence. Petitioner has filed copy of letter dated 10-7-2003 dismissing the Petitioner, copy of representation of the Petitioner against the order of dismissal and copy of the order of Appellate Authority on the appeal of the Petitioner. Management has filed 11 documents, charge sheet dated 28-3-2002, reply of workman dated 29-5-2002, the entire documents of the enquiry proceeding, the written brief of the Presenting Officer dated 30-1-2003, written brief of Defence Representative, enquiry report dated 17-3-2003, Disciplinary Authority's proceeding dated 9-6-2003, proceedings of personal hearing dated 25-6-2003. Disciplinary Authority's order of dismissal on the workman dated 10-7-2003.

8. In this matter management has initiated domestic enquiry proceeding before passing of punishment order, as such, the legality and validity of the domestic enquiry conducted by management was taken up before the hearing the parties under Sec. 11A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. My Learned Predecessor has heard regarding legality and validity of the domestic enquiry and passed his order dated 7-11-2005. He has concluded that the domestic enquiry conducted is valid.

9. I have heard both the parties. They have filed the written arguments. I have considered the averments made in claim statement, counter statement and written arguments filed by both parties.

10. This tribunal has to consider the following points in this case.

(I) Whether the action of the management in terminating the services of the Petitioner is legal and justified?

(II) To what relief the Petitioner is entitled?

11. **Point No. (I):** It is undisputed fact that the Petitioner joined the services of the bank on 17-7-1984. He was issued with the charge sheet while working at Wanaparthi branch dated 28-3-2002 with following allegations:

a. You have availed a deposit loan of Rs. 30000 and further loan of Rs. 25000 on 7-7-2001 and 14-8-2001 respectively using closed deposit receipt favouring

K. Janakamma by forging the signature of the deposit holder.

b. Again a deposit loan of Rs. 45,000 and further loan of Rs. 30,000 was availed by you on 23-6-2001 and 10-8-2001 respectively against two deposit on which loan was already existing favouring V. Padmavathamma by forging the signature of the deposit holder by you.

c. Further, you have written a deposit loan debit voucher for Rs. 65000 on 25-7-2001 again the deposit of E. Padmamma without any application/deposit receipt. Also you have not noted any lien in the deposit register, which led to misappropriation of the above amount.

d. All the entries relating to the above transactions were prepared by you and the signatures of the deposit holders were forged by you in the accounts mentioned under serial numbers 1 and 2. Total amount involved in the three accounts is Rs. 1.95 lacs.

It is also undisputed fact that the Petitioner submitted his explanation which was not found to be satisfactory by the management and domestic enquiry was ordered in which Petitioner workman participated. The Enquiry Officer submitted his report and concluded that Petitioner has withdrawn or availed a deposit loan of Rs. 30000 and Rs. 25000 on 7-7-2001 and 14-8-2001 and again availed a deposit loan of Rs. 45000 and Rs. 30000 on 23-6-2001 and 10-8-2001. He has written a deposit loan debit voucher of Rs. 65000 on 25-7-2001 without any application from E. Padmamma.

12. It is alleged by the Petitioner that he has filled the deposit loan application and has also written the name at the bottom of the application on the instructions of his superior Mr. Ram Mohan Rao. He has further stated in para 4 of the claim statement regarding, availing of loan of Rs. 45000 and Rs. 30000 on which loan was already existing, he filled in the application without considering the facts and circumstances of the case, on the instruction of Mr. Ram Mohan Rao. He himself has stated in para 5 of the claim statement that Mr. Ram Mohan Rao has given receipt and application and advised the Petitioner to write debit voucher accordingly. Accordingly, the Petitioner has written the voucher. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner has argued that the Petitioner was not given opportunity during course of the enquiry to cross examine the Assistant Government Examiner.

13. I have gone through the enquiry proceeding book. No doubt, the Petitioner has sought adjournment vide representation on 20-11-2002 for further, cross examination of the Assistant Government Examiner which has not been allowed on the ground that the Assistant Government Examiner is not available on the next date and that he has been examined at length. Thus, to my mind the argument of the Learned Counsel for the Petitioner have no force as I find that no prejudice has been caused to the Petitioner

workman by not adjourning the case for further cross examination. Further, the Learned Counsel for the Petitioner has argued that E. Padmamma was not examined nor there is report that application does not contain the signature of E. Padmamma. But I am of the view, that no such objection was raised by the Petitioner workman, either during course of domestic enquiry, or through his claim statement that the application alleged to have been filed by K. Janakamma. bears the sister of K. Janakamma. As against this, the Petitioner himself has written in para 3 of his claim statement that, "it is only the officer Sri Ram Mohan Rao who asked the Petitioner to fill the deposit loan application and at the bottom he asked the Petitioner to write the name of the Petitioner, accordingly Petitioner has done." This averment made in the claim statement amply proves that Petitioner has not challenged that the deposit loan application does not bear signature of K. Janakamma or that K. Janakamma has not signed on that application. When Petitioner is not alleging that the application of K. Janakamma does not bears the signature of K. Janakamma there was no opportunity to examine and verify the signature of K. Janakamma on her application, as such, the objection raised at the time of argument has no force it is an after thought and it carries no weight. Petitioner workman has himself admitted in para 5 and 15 of the claim statement that he has prepared all the applications and deposit vouchers and loan applications in his own handwriting but at the instance of Mr. Ram Mohan Rao. In para 17 of his claim statement he has categorically stated that when the officer asks his subordinate to write debit voucher as clerk, the Petitioner has simply obeyed the instruction of his superior and has prepared debit voucher. This prove that the Petitioner has prepared the debit voucher application of K. Janakamma and E. Padmamma with the instruction of K. Janakamma and E. Padmamma to avail such facility on their deposit receipts. His assertion that he has done this at the instruction of Mr. Ram Mohan Rao got no force and no importance can be given to such submission of the Petitioner.

14. Petitioner has been working for several years as a clerk-cum-cashier. He is well versed about the mode of payment and withdrawal of loan on deposit receipts, if he has done any such act knowing well that he is doing wrong act, it is presumed it was done with malafide intention in raising the loans. Even if he have obliged to obey instruction of his superior which was prejudicial to the interests of the customers of the bank, it can be safely concluded that what even misdeed has been committed by the Petitioner workman has been done knowing well the consequences of such action. As such workman can not shirk from the responsibility of filling the application form, writing application and writing the name of the depositor or his own name in the application knowing that it is to be used as a loan application. He prepared debit voucher also which prove that he was knowing that amount is going to

be withdrawn from the customers account. Why he did not ask the officer regarding the identity of the customers has not been stated by him nor clarified either before the Enquiry Officer or before this tribunal. This shows that even if the Petitioner has worked under the instruction of Mr. Ram Mohan Rao, the Petitioner was in collusion with his superior Mr. Ram Mohan Rao in availing the loan facility for himself or for Mr. Ram Mohan Rao on the basis of deposit receipt of another person. This prove that he is also responsible for the loss caused to the bank and the customers.

15. The Petitioner himself has stated in para 19 of the claim statement that, "an amount Rs. 190000 was made good to the bank by Mr. Ram Mohan Rao's sons. During course of his statement before the Enquiry Officer also he has stated that Mr. Ram Mohan Rao availed the above loans and as per his advice, instructions I have acted." Before Enquiry Officer he has stated "Manager did not revealed the name of the remitter who deposited Rs. 190000." How this fact came to the knowledge of the Petitioner has not been explained by the Petitioner. He has further stated before the Enquiry Officer that "Mr. Ram Mohan Rao asked to fill the applications and accordingly I have filled the same. Mr. Ram Mohan Rao has given me the receipt and applications and advised me to fill the debit voucher, I have written." All this goes to show that the Petitioner was also in collusion with Mr. Ram Mohan Rao in defrauding the bank and the customers. The report of Enquiry Officer is based on the evidence produced before him and the management has imposed proper punishment on the Petitioner because the Petitioner has lost faith of the bank management in him. More over, the continuance of the Petitioner in the service of the bank will certainly shake the very foundation and credibility of the institution, thus, the penalty of the dismissal passed by the management is legal and justified. Hence, the Petitioner is not entitled for any relief. Point No. (I) is decided accordingly.

16. Point No. (II) : Petitioner's complicity in raising fictitious loan is proved and it is concluded that punishment imposed on him is proved and it is concluded that punishment imposed on him is not excessive nor disproportionate, he is not entitled for any relief. Point No.(II) is decided accordingly.

17. From the above discussion, this tribunal is of the view that the management of Andhra Bank is justified in dismissing the Petitioner Sri P. Kamala Naik, accordingly the petition is dismissed. Hence, this award.

Award passed accordingly. Transmit.

Dictated to Smt.P. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant transcribed by her corrected by me on this the 12th day of January, 2010.

VED PRAKASH GAUR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for
the Petitioner

NIL.

Witnesses examined for
Respondent

NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL.

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 18 फरवरी, 2011

का.आ. 746.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार सिंडिकेट बैंक के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या एल. सी. सं. 121/2005) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार का 7-2-2011 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-39025/1/2010-आई आर(बी-11)]

रमेश सिंह, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th February, 2011

S.O. 746.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. L.C. No. 121 /2005) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal Labour Court Hyderabad now as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Syndicate Bank and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 7-2-2011.

[No. L-39025/1/2010-IR (B-II)]

RAMESH SINGH, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL -CUM- LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

PRESENT : Shri Ved Prakash Gaur, Presiding Officer

Dated the 13th day of January, 2010

Industrial Dispute L.C. No. 121/2005

BETWEEN:

Sri Kasturi Subba Rayudu,
S/o K. Bhaskar,
D.No. 8-102/3, Prakash Nagar,
Opp. Teja School, Kadapah,

....Petitioner

AND

I. The Deputy General Manager/
Disciplinary Authority, Syndicate Bank,
Zonal Office, Industrial Relations Divisions (W),
Pioneer House, Somajiguda,
Hyderabad—500 482.

2. The General Manager(P)/
Appellate Authority, Personal Department,
Syndicate Bank, Head Office,
Manipal—576119.Respondents

APPEARANCES:

For the Petitioner : Sri M. Ramu, Advocate

For the Respondent : Sri Alluri Krishnam Raju, Advocate

AWARD

This petition under Sec. 2 A (2) of the I.D. Act, 1947 was filed by Sri K. Subba Rayudu, an ex.employee of Syndicate Bank challenging the order of his punishment of dismissal dated 22-4-93 and to reinstate him in service with full service benefits.

2. It has been alleged by the workman that he joined as clerk in 1974 in Respondent bank. He belongs to scheduled caste community and has a large family to look after. He used to discharge his duty with honesty, integrity and with diligence. However, the Respondent placed him under suspension w.e.f. 27-11-1989 pending investigation in certain alleged irregularities while workman was functioning as cashier at Devapatla branch of Cudappah district. After 14 months Respondent bank served charge sheet No. CGS/Hyderabad/91/7 dated 1-2-1991 alleging therein that while the workman was functioning as cashier at Devapatla branch, Cuddapah, he accepted certain amounts from two SB A/c holders, made entries of these amounts in their respective pass books but did not account the said amounts in the books of branch and further the workman removed Rs. 1000 from single lock cash book in the denomination of Rs. 50 on 20-11-1989 and on 21-11-1989. He was trying to replace this amount in cash in various denominations. However, the charge sheet was not accompanied by list of witnesses and documents on which the allegation was based. Due to non-supply of the documents, the Petitioner could not furnish a satisfactory reply nor his union did the same. Ultimately, without receiving a reply an enquiry was ordered vide order dated 13-12-1991. The Enquiry Officer informed that he will be holding enquiry proceeding initially on 24-4-1992 which was subsequently postponed and held on 29-5-1992, 3-9-1992 and 4-9-1992. The workman pleaded with the Enquiry Officer that he is not feeling well and requested him to grant further time but the enquiry was conducted *ex parte*. The document relied upon by the Enquiry Officer was sent to the Petitioner along with proceeding dated 29-5-1992. The Enquiry Officer submitted his report on 14-11-1992 a copy of which was sent to the workman to submit his explanation within 7 days. Due to ill-health the workman could not submit his explanation. At that juncture on 30-12-1992 workman requested for conducting fresh enquiry which was rejected vide letter No. 001/326(1)/IRS dated 2-1-1993 without assigning any reasons. The Disciplinary Authority vide his letter No. 233/326(1) IRS dated 24-1-2003 proposed

punishment of dismissal from service and finally vide proceedings dated 22-4-1993 No. PRS(IN)/DGM/Hyderabad/93/23 dated 22-4-1993 imposed punishment of dismissal from service with immediate effect. Petitioner workman submitted appeal before the Appellate Authority who directed the workman to appear for personal hearing on 14-9-1993. Petitioner appeared there and pleaded that he was not afforded proper opportunity and enquiry be reopened, but his request was not considered and his appeal was dismissed. Petitioner has pleaded that he belongs to scheduled caste community, he has to support a large family. He has suffered from abject poverty and was deprived of basic necessities of life food and shelter. He lost his mental balance on seeing the sufferings of his family. He pleaded that he could not approach this forum due to ill-health, now he is aged of 59 years and hence, he has filed this petition. He has alleged that non appearance in the enquiry was explained by him in detail. He submitted medical certificate of his serious illness which has not been considered. The order passed against him is arbitrary and requested that award be passed reinstating him in the service.

3. The management has filed counter statement stating therein that while working as clerk at Devapatla branch of the bank. The workman was entrusted with cash duties during the period 21-10-1989 to 27-11-1989. While functioning as cashier the Petitioner workman failed to credit Rs. 120 and Rs. 890 to SB A/c No. 115 of Sri K. Shasidhar Sharma which were received from him on 21-10-1989 and 10-11-1989. He also did not credited Rs. 1300 to SB A/c No. 694 of Sri Chandrasekhar, received from the said account holder on 20-11-1989 in token of having received the said sums he made credit entry in the pass books of the customers and affixed his initials but the amounts were not credited in the books of accounts of the branch and no credit was given to the respective customers' SB accounts of the branch. All these amounts being misappropriated by the Petitioner workman thereby he gained undue pecuniary advantage.

4. Again on 20-11-1989 the workman moved a sum of Rs. 1000 from the Single Lock cash box of the bank while working as cashier which came to light after verification of the closing cash balance on the same date. On 20-11-1989 when the inspectors were inspecting the branch accounts and when verifying the single lock cash balance, the Petitioner Sri K. Subbarayudu tried to replace the said amount of said sum of Rs. 1000 removed by him earlier on 20-11-1989 and was caught red handed by inspecting officials. He was charge sheeted for committing gross misconduct in terms of clause 19.5 (j) of the Bipartite Settlement and he was placed under suspension. Explanation was called from him. He submitted his explanation which was not found satisfactory and enquiry was ordered. Enquiry Officer was appointed to conduct

enquiry however, Petitioner did not participated, as such, the Enquiry was conducted ex-parte and Enquiry Officer submitted report after taking both oral and documentary evidence of management witnesses and held that the charges against the Petitioner were proved on the basis of which punishment of dismissal was imposed vide order dated 22-4-1993. Petitioner filed appeal which was dismissed vide order dated 2-11-1993. The Petitioner has no unblemished career as he indulged in misappropriation and theft of banks' property. Proper and fair opportunity was afforded to the Petitioner to participate in the enquiry. The Petitioner was dismissed from service in the year 1993 and he has approached this tribunal after 13 years and no reason has been assigned for not filing the petition at an early stage. Petition is devoid of merit and deserves to be dismissed.

5. Parties were directed to produce their respective evidence. Petitioner workman has filed 12 documents, i.e. charge sheet dated 1-2-1991, his representation requesting time dated 20-2-1991, letter requesting time to submit reply dated nil, letter of appointment of Enquiry Officer dated 13-12-91, letter dated 2-5-1992 of the Enquiry Officer enclosing copy of enquiry proceeding dated 24-4-1992, copy of enquiry proceeding recorded at Devapatla dated 29-5-1992, copy of enquiry proceeding recorded at ZO dated 3-9-1992, letter addressed by the Petitioner to Enquiry Officer dated 1-6-1992, letter to AGM, ZO, Hyderabad dated 12-12-1992, letter of Petitioner informing the name of his DA of AGM dated 30-12-1992, copy of letter dated 2-11-93, show cause notice dated 24-2-1993. Respondent have filed 15 documents exerox copies of charge sheet, xerox copy of letter appointing Enquiry Officer, xerox copy of extension of time seeking letter dated 19-6-1991, copy of letter seeking further time dated 19-7-1991, letter of Enquiry Officer to Petitioner intimating date of enquiry dated 10-1-1992, letter of Enquiry Officer to Petitioner intimating date of enquiry dated 2-5-1992, letter of Enquiry Officer to Petitioner intimating the proceedings held on 25-9-1992 of enquiry dated 1-6-1992, letter of Enquiry Officer to Petitioner intimating date of enquiry dated 14-7-1992, letter of Enquiry Officer to Petitioner intimating date of enquiry dated 4-8-1992, copy of enquiry proceedings, copy of enquiry report dated 14-11-1992, representation of Petitioner to Disciplinary Authority dated 20-4-1992, copy of proceedings of Disciplinary Authority dated 22-4-1993, copy of proceedings of Appellate Authority dated 3-11-1993.

6. In the present case before taking action against the Petitioner domestic enquiry was conducted by management as such, the legality and validity of domestic enquiry was considered before hearing the parties under Sec. 11A of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. 16-2-2009 was fixed for hearing on the question of validity of domestic enquiry, but it was not challenged by the Petitioner workman

and he opted to remain absent on that date, as such, the domestic enquiry was held to be legal and valid and case was forwarded for hearing under Sec. 11A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. Petitioner's counsel appeared on the next date on 6-7-2009, thereafter he did not appear for argument, several adjournments were given for argument of the parties finally on 13-12-2010, the Respondent's counsel filed written arguments and made oral submissions, which were heard.

7. In the present case this tribunal has to consider,

(I) Whether the order of dismissal from service imposed by the management on the present Petitioner is legal and justified or not?

(II) To what relief if any is the Petitioner is entitled?

8. **Point No. (I):** In the present case it is undisputed fact that Petitioner was appointed in the year 1974 and he was placed under suspension w.e.f. 27-11-1989. It is also undisputed fact that services of the Petitioner were terminated vide proceeding No. PRS(IN) DGM/Hyderabad/93/23 dated 22-4-1993. It is also undisputed that he preferred an appeal which was dismissed by proceeding dated 22-4-93. It is also undisputed fact that Petitioner has filed this petition on 18-11-2005, i.e. more than 12½ years after the final dismissal order. The only contention of the Petitioner is that, he belongs to scheduled caste community and he has large family to support and his family is suffering due to which he is suffering mental trauma. However, it has to be considered whether the dismissal of the Petitioner was justified or not, Petitioner himself has stated that he was served with a charge sheet wherein it was alleged that he received money through the account holders on different dated but did not deposit that amount in the accounts, he simply made entry in the respective pass books of the account holders, but did not make the entry in the account books of the bank and did not deposit the amount in the bank. Secondly he took out or removed Rs. 1000 on 20-11-1989 and he was trying to make good that amount by placing other notes of different denominations of 21-11-1989 and was caught red handed by the Inspecting officials. A charge sheet was served on the Petitioner workman, he was asked to file his explanation but he did not file explanation. An enquiry was ordered, vide letter dated 19-6-1991 Petitioner sought time for extension of time. There is another letter dated 19-7-1991 through which also Petitioner sought time to file explanation. Both these letters prove that the charges sheet was personally served on the Petitioner. He was given opportunity to explain his conduct, even after seeking time twice through his own letters he did not file any explanation or reply to the charge sheet. It is also undisputed fact that enquiry was ordered and the same was communicated to the Petitioner. The Enquiry Officer has intimated the Petitioner, the date and place of enquiry and time of the enquiry, but the entire proceeding book shows and proves that Petitioner has not participated in

the enquiry proceeding nor has requested the Enquiry Officer to postpone the enquiry Proceeding as such, the Enquiry Officer has no other option but to set the enquiry ex-parte and take down the evidence of the management. The enquiry proceeding book further prove that on 23-4-1992, the Petitioner has sent a telegram to the Enquiry Officer informing him that he is not feeling well and requested for postponement of the enquiry on the basis of which the enquiry was postponed and next date has been informed to the Petitioner. Management has examined as many as six witnesses and marked 13 exhibits i.e. MEX.1 to MEX13 during enquiry. Sri N. Niranjana Murthy has been produced as MW1 who has conducted investigation in the matter of irregularities committed by Petitioner workman and who has produced 13 documents from the bank which were marked by him as MEX1 to MEX13. He has stated that he has examined the pass book of Sri Shashidhar Sharma who complained that he remitted a sum of Rs. 120 on 21-10-1989 and 10-11-1989 to his SB A/c No. 115. He produced his pass book wherein the entries were made by the Petitioner workman in his own hand writing but said amount has not been reflected in the ledger folio etc. MW2 Sri Omkar Dussa, Manager (Inspection) stated that he was inspecting the branch with respect to the books of accounts of 21-11-1989. He was accompanied with Sri Syed Aseem, Dy. Inspector who started verification of the cash kept in single lock in cashier's cabin. Sri Syed Aseem informed him that cashier is trying to insert some cash into the box to cover the shortage, then, the witness verified the single lock cash balance as on 20-11-1989 and he found that 20 pieces of Rs. 50 denomination notes amounting to Rs. 1000 was less. He directed Sri Syed Aseem to mention in MEX. 14 and endorsement therein, at the time of commencement of inspection the Petitioner was asked to sign the endorsement, Charge sheeted employee was enquired about the shortage of the amount, who informed the witness that in order to meet out some medical expenses for his family he has taken away Rs. 1000 from the single lock. He also admitted that while Sri Syed Aseem started checking of cash balances in the single lock he made an attempt to insert a sum of Rs. 1000 to avoid detection.

9. This statement of MW2 was corroborated by MW3 Sri Syed Aseem. Sri Shashidhar Sharma, account holder was examined as MW4, who stated that he deposited Rs. 120 on 21-10-1989 and Rs. 890 on 10-11-1989, produced his pass book wherein the Petitioner workman has made entries and put his initials. He gave that amount to Sri Subbarayudu for which he gave a letter to the Manager because, charge sheeted employee has not issued counter foil of receiving the amount. MW5 Sri N. Subramanian, Manager of Devapatla branch, he has corroborated the testimony of Sri Syed Aseem. MW6 Sri Saifulla Basha, Pgimy agent-Devapatla branch, MW7 Sri M.Chandra Sekhar, account holder SB a/c No. 694 who has also deposed that he

addressed two letters dated 24-11-89 and 15-6-90 regarding depositing the amount in his SB a/c in the month of July, handed over Rs. 1300 to charge sheeted employee on 20-11-89 who made entry in his pass book and signed the pass book. All these evidence and material goes to prove that the Petitioner has received the amount from Sri. K. Shashidhar Sharma and Sri M. Chandra Sekhar for depositing the amount the bank, he simply make entry in the pass book but did not make entry in the bank's ledger book and thereby he pocketed that amounts for his own gains, Not only that the Petitioner has taken away Rs. 1000 from the cash box of the bank on 20-11-1989 and tried to return the said amount on 21-11-1989 while doing so he was caught by the inspecting staff. This prove that Petitioner workman is a dishonest employee, as such, the management has not committed any illegal or unjustifiability in ordering dismissal of such a dishonest employee because, such employee is detrimental to the honour of the institution. The bank has not committed any illegality in imposing the punishment to the Petitioner. Point No. (I) is decided accordingly.

10. Point No. (II): The Petitioner workman has not been able to prove that the action of the management is unjustifiable or illegal, as against this, it is amply proved that the Petitioner has committed misappropriation and theft of the bank's property as he does not deserve to be retained in the bank's service. He is not entitled for any relief and he deserves no sympathy. The Petitioner himself is responsible for the state of affairs his family is facing but he does not deserve any sympathy on the round of financial hardship. Petition is devoid of merit. More over, it has been filed after 12½ years without any cogent reason or without any application for condonation, as such, no relief can be granted to him. Point No. (II) is decided accordingly.

11. From the above discussion, this tribunal is of the view that the management of Syndicate Bank is justified in dismissing the Petitioner Sri Kasturi Subba Rayudu, accordingly the petition is dismissed. Hence, this award.

Award passed accordingly. Trasmit.

Dictated to Smt. P. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant transcribed by her corrected by me on this the 13th day of January, 2011.

VED PRAKASH GAUR, Persiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for Respondent
NIL	NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 18 फरवरी, 2011

का.आ. 747.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार आन्ध्रा बैंक के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या एल.सी. 142/2007) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 13-1-2011 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-39025/1/2010-आई आर (बी- II)]

रमेश सिंह, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th February, 2011

S.O. 747.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. L.C.142/2007) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Hyderabad now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Andhra Bank and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 13-1-2011.

[No. L-39025/1/2010-IR (B-II)]

RAMESH SINGH, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD

PRESENT: Shri VED PRAKASH GAUR, Presiding
Officer

Dated the 8th day of September, 2010

Industrial Dispute No. L.C. 142/2007

BETWEEN

Sri G. Vivekananda,
S/o Girivenkajah,

R/o Surya Medical Shop,
Naidupet (M),
Pillargudi Street
Nellore.

.... Petitioner

AND

1. The General Manager (Personnel),
Andhra Bank,
Head Office,
Hyderabad.

2. The Assistant General Manager
Andhra Bank,
Zonal Office,
Nellore District.

....Respondent

APPEARANCES:

For the Petitioner : M/s. G. Vidya Sagar, K. Udaya
Sri & P. Sudheer Rao, Advocates

For the Respondent : M/s. S. Udayachala Rao,
S. Vikramaditya Babu, S. Mujib
Kumar & M. Raghmani,
Advocates

AWARD

This is a petition filed under Sec. 2A (2) of the I.D. Act by Sri G. Vivekananda challenging the order compulsory retirement from the bank's service dated 22-5-2000 and numbered in this Court as L.C.I.D. No. 142/2007 and notices were issued to the parties.

2. The Petitioner has filed this petition challenging the order of compulsory retirement. As the case is posted for filing of counter and documents, Respondent No.2 has submitted memo stating that the post of Assistant General Manager has been shifted to Andhra Bank, Zonal Office at Tirupathi. Thereafter, Petitioner sought time for submission of petition with amended cause title.

3. On 8-9-2010, workman or his counsel called absent. Petitioner's counsel has not filed amendment application as directed through order dated 20-7-2010, as such, this case is dismissed for non-compliance of the order dated 20-7-2010.

Accordingly, a Nil award is passed. Transmit.

Dictated to Smt P. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant transcribed by her corrected by me on this the 8th day of September, 2010.

VED PRAKASH GAUR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner

NIL

Witnesses examined for the Respondent

NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 18 फरवरी, 2011

का.आ. 748.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार सेन्ट्रल बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक

अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, जयपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 25/2006) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 17-2-2011 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12011/173/2005-आई आर(बी-II)]

रमेश सिंह, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th February, 2011

S.O. 748.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 25/2006) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Jaipur now as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Central Bank of India and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 17-2-2011.

[No. L-12011/173/2005-IR (B-II)]

RAMESH SINGH, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL- CUM-LABOUR COURT, JAIPUR

PRESENT : N. K. PUROHIT, Presiding Officer

I.D. 25/2006

Reference No. L-12011/173/2005-IR (B-II)

dated: 20-1-2006

The General Secretary,
Central Bank Karamchari Union,
Anand Bhawan,
Basement S. C. Road,
Jaipur.

V/s

The Asstt. General Manager,
Central Bank of India,
Regional Office, S. C. Road,
Anand Bhawan,
Jaipur-302006.

AWARD

31-1-2011

1. The Central Government in exercise of the powers conferred under clause (d) of sub-section 1 & 2 (A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 has referred the following Industrial dispute to this tribunal for adjudication which runs as under:—

“Whether the action of the management of Central Bank of India, Jaipur in awarding the punishment of re-designation as peon from initial post of his recruitment as Armed Guard dated

13-11-2003 and withdrawing Spl. Pay of Armed Guard Shri Prahalad Singh without mentioning any specific period is legal and justified? If not, what relief the workman is entitled to and from which date?”

2. Pursuant to the receipt of reference order, the registered notices were issued to both the parties. Shri Rajeev Sharma representative on behalf of the non-applicant appeared on 25-4-06. On behalf of the applicant union Shri Rajesh Maherishi appeared and sought time for filing claim statement and authority letter. On subsequent dates i.e. 17-5-06 & 7-6-06, he sought further time for filing claim statement & authority letter. Thereafter, the post of the Presiding Officer remained vacant therefore, fresh notices were issued after posting of the Presiding Officer.

3. The representative on behalf of the non-applicant appeared on 2-6-10 but none appeared on behalf of the applicant side. The acknowledgement receipts pertaining to registered notices sent for appearing on 23-11-10 & 12-1-11 are on the record. On perusal of the same it appears that registered notices have been served upon the applicant union. The applicant union has not appeared to filed its claim statement despite service of registered notices. It appears that the union is not willing to contest the case further.

4. Under these circumstances no material could be brought on record for adjudicating the reference under consideration on merits. Resultantly, “No Claim Award” is passed in this matter. The reference under adjudication is answered accordingly.

5. Award as above.

N. K. PUROHIT, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 18 फरवरी, 2011

का.आ. 749.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन के संबंध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय-2, चण्डीगढ़ के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 36/2010) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 9-2-2011 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/31/2010-आई आर(बी-II)]

रमेश सिंह, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th February, 2011

S.O. 749.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 36/2010) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court-II, Chandigarh now as shown in the Annexure in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bank of India and their workman, which

was received by the Central Government on 9-2-2011.

[No. L-12012/31/2010-IR (B-II)]

RAMESH SINGH, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-II, CHANDIGARH

Present : SHRI A. K. RASTOGI, Presiding Officer

Case ID No. 36/2K10

Registered on 10-6-2010

Sh. Mukesh Kumar C/o Sh. Jawahar Lal & A. R. Panchanand
Singh, H. No. 154, DLF, Phase-I, Faridabad

...Applicant

Versus

The Manager, Bank of India, 14/1, Mathura Road,
Faridabad

...Respondent

APPEARANCES:

For the Workman : Sh. Jawahar Lal/Panchanand
Singh ARs for workman

For the Management: None for Management

AWARD

Passed on 28th January, 2011

Central Government vide notification No. L-12012/31/2010-IR (B-II) dated 3-6-2010 by exercising its powers under Section 10 Sub-section (1) Clause (d) and Sub-section 2 (A) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as Act) has referred the following industrial dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal :—

“Whether the action of the management of Bank of India, Faridabad for disengaging Sh. Mukesh Kumar S/o Sh. Daya Chand, Sweeper w.e.f. 21-11-2008 from SME Branch Faridabad is fair and legal ? What relief the workman is entitled to ?”

The workman has raised an industrial dispute stating that he had been working with the management as a Sweeper since 23-3-1999. The management took the work of Peon and Watchman also. He used to work 12 hours daily and sometimes 16 hours also. He is regular muster roll employee. The workman asked for minimum wages and payment of overtime, whereupon he was disengaged from 21-11-2008. He had not been paid due wages and retrenchment compensation. His termination is illegal and unjustified. He had not been paid due wages and retrenchment compensation. His termination is illegal and

unjustified. He has demanded his reinstatement with full back wages and continuity of service.

Management appeared but did not file the written statement. Workman also absented on 22-10-2010, 9-12-2010 and 28-1-2011. Workman filed claim statement only. He did not file any affidavit or any other document in support of his claim. There being no evidence in support of his claim, the claim of the workman is not acceptable. He has failed to prove that he was in the employment of management and was a workman and his services were terminated by the management in violation of the provisions of Industrial Disputes Act. The reference is therefore, answered against the workman. Let two copies of award after due compliance be sent to the Central Government for further necessary action.

ASHOK KUMAR RASTOGI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 18 फरवरी, 2011

का.आ. 750.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार सेन्ट्रल बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, चेन्नई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 80/2007) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 9-2-2011 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/97/2007-आई आर (बी-II)]

रमेश सिंह, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th February, 2011

S.O. 750.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 80/2007) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Chennai now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Central Bank of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 9-2-2011.

[No. L-12012/97/2007-IR (B-II)]

RAMESH SINGH, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, CHENNAI

Wednesday, the 2nd February, 2011

Present: A. N. Janardanan, Presiding Officer

Industrial Dispute No. 80/2007

[In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10

of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), between the Management of Central Bank of India and their Workman]

BETWEEN

Smt. S. Bhanu : Ist Party/Petitioner

Vs.

The Regional Manager : 2nd Party/Management
Central Bank of India,
Regional Office,
Post Box No.377
Raheja Complex,
3rd Floor, 69, Anna Salai,
Chennai- 600002.

APPEARANCE:

For the 1st Party/Petitioner : Sri K. M. Ramesh,
Advocate
For the 2nd Party/
Management : M/s. T. S. Gopalan &
Co., Advocates

AWARD

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. L-12012/97/2007-IR (B-II) dated 28-11-2007 referred the following Industrial Disputes to this Tribunal for adjudication.

The schedule mentioned in that order is:

“Whether the action of the bank management of Central Bank of India in terminating the services of Smt. S. Bhanu is legal and justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?”

2. After the receipt of Industrial Dispute, this Tribunal has numbered it as ID 80/2007 and issued notices to both sides. Both sides entered appearance through their Advocates and filed their Claim, Counter and Rejoinder Statements as the case may be.

3. The case of the petitioner in a nutshell in the Claim Statement and Rejoinder Statement is that she while was working as Computer Terminal Operator in Vellammal Extension Counter, Mogappair Branch of Respondent/Bank at Chennai was charge sheeted alleged of having committed lapses, 11 in number. In the enquiry held not in a fair and proper manner and personally biased against her by the Enquiry Officer she was found guilty of having embezzled various sums of money on various dated and committed misappropriation, which is not tenable. There is violation of principles of natural justice in the conducting of the enquiry. The punishment of dismissal is also illegal and unjustified and is to be interfered with under Section-11A of the ID Act. The petitioner is to be reinstated with all benefits.

4. The Counter Statement case in substance is that the petitioner defrauded the bank with huge sums of money in various transactions, which she made good by admitting the charges. The charges also stand proved from the documentary evidence. Petitioner failed to make out a case for interference. Management lost confidence in her. The dismissal is only to be upheld.

5. Points for consideration are:

- (i) Whether the dismissal of the petitioner from service is legal and justified?
- (ii) To what relief the concerned petitioner is entitled?

Points (i) & (ii)

6. On commencement of enquiry and the petitioner having been examined in part by way of sworn affidavit in lieu of Chief Examination and marking Ex. W1 to Ex. W.11, thereafter from time to time the petitioner continued to remain absent and failed to pursue with further enquiry and at last when the ID came up today her learned counsel made an endorsement on the Claim Statement to the effect that there are no instructions from the petitioner and that the ID is not pressed under his dated signature.

7. In view of the above the dispute is dismissed as not pressed for adjudication on the referred question.

(Dictated to the P.A., transcribed and typed by him, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court on this day the 2nd February, 2011)

A.N. JANARDANAN, Presiding Officer

Witnesses Examined

For the 1st Party/Petitioner :

None

For the 2nd Party/Management

None

Documents Marked :

On the petitioner's side

Ex. No.	Date	Description
		NIL

On the Management's side

Ex. No.	Date	Description
		NIL

नई दिल्ली, 18 फरवरी, 2011

का.आ. 751.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार यूको बैंक के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध

में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, कोलकाता के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 08/2007) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 9-2-2011 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12011/110/2006-आई आर (बी- II)]
रमेश सिंह, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th February, 2011

S.O. 751.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 08/2007) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Kolkata now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of UCO BANK and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 9-2-2011.

[No. L-12011/110/2006-IR (B-II)]

RAMESH SINGH, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT KOLKATA

REFERENCE No. 08/2008

PARTIES: Employers in relation to the management of UCO Bank

AND

Their workmen

PRESENT : Mr. Justice Manik Mohan Sarkar, Presiding Officer

APPEARANCE:

On behalf of the : None
Management

On behalf of the : None
Workmen

State: West Bengal Industry: Banking

Dated : 31st January, 2011

AWARD

By Order No. 12011/110/2006-IR (B-II) dated 28-5-2007 the Government of India, Ministry of Labour in exercise of its powers under Section 10 (1) (d) and (2A) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication:

“Whether the action of the management of UCO Bank by not regularizing Shri Bholanath Roy, Part-time sweeper who claimed to have been working for more than

21 years continuously in UCO Bank is justified? If not, what relief the concerned workman is entitled to?”

2. None is present from either of the parties on call today. Absence of the parties are evident from the record on consecutive dates. They have appeared for the last time on 16-7-2010 on which date an application was filed from the side of the workmen with a prayer for withdrawal of the present reference as the dispute was settled in between the parties out of Court and on that date the Tribunal directed the workmen side to file a fresh application to that effect since the application filed on that date was not proper. Non-appearance of the parties, specially the workmen side appears to have been done in view of the settlement of the issue amicably in between the employer and the employee concerned and for that reason it may be presumed that no industrial dispute is in existence at present for the settlement of the issue.

3. In view of the same, the present reference is disposed of finally for non-prosecution and an Award is passed accordingly.

Dated, Kolkata,
31st January, 2011

JUSTICE MANIK MOHAN SARKAR, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 18 फरवरी, 2011

का. आ. 752.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार सेन्ट्रल बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, नागपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या सी जी आई टी/एन जी पी/14/2005) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 9-2-2011 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/193/2004-आई आर (बी- II)]

रमेश सिंह, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th February, 2011

S. O. 752.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. CGIT/NGP/14/2005) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Nagpur now as shown in the Annexure, in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Central Bank of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 9-2-2011.

[No. L-12012/193/2004-IR (B-II)]

RAMESH SINGH, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE SHRI J. P. CHAND, PRESIDING OFFICER,
CGIT-CUM-LABOUR COURT, NAGPUR**

Case No. CGIT/NGP/14/2005

Date: 31-01-2011.

Party No. 1 : The Regional Manager,
Central Bank of India, Regional
Office, Victoria Building,
Kamptee Road,
Nagpur.

Versus

Party No. 2 : Shri Sudarshan Laxman Chaware,
R/o Bhandar Mohala, Indora,
PO Bezanbag,
Nagpur.

AWARD

(Dated: 31st January, 2011)

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) ("the Act" in short), the Central Government has referred the industrial dispute between the employers, in relation to the management of Central Bank of India and their workman, Shri Sudarshan Laxman Chaware ("the workman" in short) for adjudication, as per letter No. L-12012/193/2004-IR(B-II) dated 19-01-2005, with the following schedule:—

"Whether the action of the management of Central Bank of India through its Regional Manager, Central Bank of India, Regional Office, Victoria Building, Kamptee Road, Nagpur in terminating the services of the disputant workman, Shri Sudarshan Laxman Chaware, R/o Bhandar Mohalla, Indora, PO Bezanbag, Dist. Nagpur is fair, proper and justified & whether the disputant workman is entitled for reinstatement in service along with back wages? If not, to what relief the disputant workman is entitled to?"

2. On receipt of the reference, parties were notice to filed their respective statement of claim and written statement, in response to which, the workman, Sudarshan Laxman Chaware ("the workman" in short) filed his statement of claim and management of Central Bank of India (Party No. 1 in short) filed their written statement.

3. The workman in his statement of claim has pleaded inter-alia that he has studied upto 9th standard and he registered his name in the Employment Exchange and applied for his appointment on daily wages and was appointed by the Party No.1 on 5-10-1989 as a Peon on daily wage basis and accordingly he worked in different branches of the Bank such as, Nagpur branch.

Dharampeth branch, Abhyankar Nagar : branch, Zonal Office and lastly in Gumthala branch and his entire service record was unblemished and his working hours were from 10 AM to 5 PM and the last salary drawn by him was Rs. 2750 basic and his service was continuous without any break since the date of his joining i.e. 5-10-1989 and in the year 1998, the Party No.1 started issuing appointment orders of 30 days/58 days but before the end of every order, the Party No.1 had been giving the new appointment order without any break and thus he worked with the Party No.1 till 1-8-2002 on the basic pay of Rs. 2750 continuously and the Party No.1 also conducted sub-staff examination on 15-11-1998 for the employees working with it (Party No.1) including the workers, who were working on daily wages for years together, with a view to give them permanency and he was also allowed to appear in the said examination and he cleared the examination securing the number one position but in spite of the same, the Party No.1 did not grant him the status of permanent employee and he was permitted by the Party No.1 in the examination only with the object of making him permanent as the policy matter and at that time, he was not at all informed about obtaining of NOC from the Employment Exchange for issuing order of permanency but passing of the sub-staff examination successfully was the only criteria, but before the Asstt. Labour Commissioner, the Party No.1 for the first time disclosed that as he failed to obtain "No Objection Certificate" from the Employment Exchange, he was not given the permanency order.

The further case of the workman is that the last appointment order was on 26-6-2002 for a period of 35 days ending on 1-8-2002 and on 1-8-2002, the Branch Manager, Gumthala told him of giving the next appointment within to three days but in spite of his repeated oral request, no appointment order was given. It is necessary to mention that the workman subsequently amended the claim petition after obtaining the necessary permission of the Tribunal and pleaded that the Party No.1 issued a temporary appointment order on 31-8-2002 asking him to work from 2-9-2002 to 29-10-2002 on basic pay of Rs. 2750 at Gumthala Branch and accordingly he worked in Gumthala Branch from 2-9-2002 to 29-10-2002 and he had completed continuous service of 240 days preceding the 12 months from the date of termination of his service i.e. 29-10-2002 and after 29-10-2002, no appointment order was issued by the Party No.1 and his service was terminated orally on 29-10-2002 and neither one month's notice nor any pay in lieu of notice nor any retrenchment compensation was given to him at the time of termination of his service by the Party No.1, as per the provisions of Section 25-F of the Act and the Party No.1 also violated the provision of Section 25-H by retaining the junior employees in the establishment like Shri Vinod Kanojia at main branch.

Nagpur, while terminating his service and Party No.1 also did not publish the seniority list as required under Rule 77 of the Industrial Disputes Rules and as such, his termination order w.e.f. 29-10-2002 was illegal and violative of the principles of natural justice and he is entitled for reinstatement in service alongwith full back wages by setting aside the oral termination order dated 29-10-2002 and as he worked continuously for 240 days, by virtue of modal standing orders, he had acquired the status of permanent employee and as such, the Party No.1 should not have orally terminated his services in an arbitrary manner and in contravention of the service conditions applicable to the bank employees, reached under various bilateral agreements between the recognized unions and managements and on the said ground also, his termination from service is required to be declared illegal. The workman has prayed to declare that the Party No.1 adopted unfair labour practice by illegally terminating his service w.e.f. 29-10-2002, to set aside the order of oral termination dated 29-10-2002 and for reinstatement alongwith full back wages and other service benefits with continuity in service.

4. In reply, it is pleaded by the Party No.1 in its written statement that it has no knowledge about registration of the name of the workman in the Employment Exchange and the workman has not furnished any particulars about it and the workman was not appointed by it on 5-10-1989 as a Peon on daily wages and the workman also did not work in various branches of the Bank and he worked on daily wages, only for a limited period, as and when required and his name, was not borne on the muster rolls and as such, there was no question of maintaining any service record of the workman and the workman was paid his remuneration on daily wages basis on vouchers and he was not being paid salary at the rate of Rs. 2750 per month as alleged by him and as regards the working hours, the workman worked as a casual daily rated worker as and when required by the Bank. The Party No.1 has denied that the workman was appointed on 5-10-1989 by it and his services were continued without any break and from 1998, it started issuing appointment orders for 30 days and 58 days and it used to issue fresh appointment order before the expiry of the earlier order and he was paid basic salary of Rs. 2750 till 1-8-2002 and as per the particulars available with it, the workman worked from 15-10-2001 to 11-12-2001, 7-1-2002 to 5-3-2002, 13-3-2002 to 11-4-2002, 22-4-2002 to 18-6-2002, 28-6-2002 to 1-8-2002 in total for 239 days and during the said period, the workman was engaged on daily wages on a purely temporary basis, particularly, when the shifting work of Gumthala Branch of the Bank to its new premises was going on and on completion of the shifting work, since his services were not required by the Bank any more, he was

discontinued. The Party No.1 has further pleaded that the Bank conducted written recruitment test for sub-staff category on 15-11-1998 and the daily wagers, who were engaged by it in the past for specific period and who were eligible to appear in the written recruitment test had appeared in the written test on 15-11-1998 and as the workman also qualified to appear in the written recruitment test, he was allowed to appear in the test, but it has denied that those employees who had worked on daily wages for years together appeared for the said test, as the bank wanted to give them status of permanency. It has pleaded that the sub-staff written recruitment test was conducted by the Regional Office of the Bank at Nagpur, as per the guidelines received from the Central Office of the Bank at Mumbai and the workman and other candidates were allowed to appear in the test on the terms and conditions that "No Objection Certificate" will be obtained by the candidates from Nagpur Employment Exchange, for not complying with their norms, while engaging them temporarily and the result of the written recruitment test will be announced only after obtaining "no objection certification" from the Office of the Employment Exchange, Nagpur and in all 17 candidates were found successful in the said written test including the workman having his Roll No.7, as informed by the Central Office of the Bank and thereafter, the management of the Bank made correspondence with the Office of the District Employment Exchange and Self Employment Guidance Centre, Nagpur for issuance of "No Objection Certificate" in favour of those candidates, who had cleared the written test and declared successful, but, the Authority of the Employment Exchange had informed it that since the names of the candidates declared successful were not sponsored by the Employment Exchange for taking them on daily wages in sub-staff cadre, it was not possible to issue "No Objection Certificate" to any of the seventeen successful candidates and under those circumstances, it could not further process the list of candidates who had cleared the written test and further decision could not be taken by it in the matter, but in spite of the same, as and when work was available, the workman was engaged on daily wages on a purely temporary basis for stipulated period and as regards the work performed by the workman as a daily wager prior to 15-11-1998, the particulars regarding the period and the number of days of work performed by him are not available with it and no assurance was given on 1-8-2002 by the Branch Manager, Gumthala Branch of giving him next appointment order within 2 to 3 days and neither the Branch Manager nor the Regional Manager of the Bank had any power or authority to issue appointment order to the workman and the discontinuation of the workman cannot be termed as oral termination, as he being a daily rated casual worker engaged on a purely temporary basis, depending upon the availability of work.

there was no question of continuing him as such, for an indefinite period and as soon as it was realized that no work was available at Gurnthala Branch for him, he was discontinued and no candidate can be employed in the Bank as a matter of right, surpassing the set and definite recruitment procedure, which is to be strictly followed by the Bank and before the ALC (C), the Bank management appeared and clarified its position on the above said lines and the conciliation proceedings failed and as the workman was a daily rated casual worker, there was no question of application of any of the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act and therefore, there was no necessity of compliance of the Provisions of Section 25-F of the Act and it is also false to say that the service of the workman was terminated, while retaining others in employment who were allegedly juniors to him. The Party No.1 has denied all other allegations made in the statement of claim and pleaded that the workman is not entitled for any relief.

5. Parties were allowed to adduce evidence. The workman examined himself as a witness besides relying on documentary evidence. On behalf of the management, one Shri Vilas Narayanrao Mirkute was examined as a witness.

6. The workman in his evidence on affidavit has reiterated the stands taken by him in the statement of claim. He has also proved the documents as Ext.W-1 to W-10. In his cross-examination, the workman has admitted that bank has never issued a written order appointing him permanently on the vacant post and he worked as a daily wager, whenever he was asked for the same and he was paid on vouchers and though he had appeared in the test held on 15-11-98 and there was publication of a list, he was not given any appointment order consequent upon the same and nobody from the said list was given appointment and on his enquiry, he was informed by the bank that he would be engaged whenever there would be any vacancy.

The witness examined on behalf of the management has stated that the workman was engaged on daily wages basis as a casual worker as and when required and he was not a permanent employee of the bank and he worked for 239 days from 15-10-2001 to 1-8-2002 and the bank does not have the documents regarding the engagement of the workman prior to 15-11-1998. This witness has also stated that the workman did not work continuously from 1989 and though written recruitment test was conducted for appointment of sub-staff category on 15-11-1998 and the workman cleared the test, due to non-submission of NOC by the Employment Exchange, further action could not be taken in the matter and as the workman was a daily wager, he was not engaged by the Bank when no such work was available and as such, the workman is not entitled for any relief. In his cross-examination, the witness for the management has admitted that he has no personal

knowledge about the work of the petitioner and his evidence is on the basis of records and he has not filed any document in support of his claim that the workman worked for 239 days from 15-10-2001 to 1-8-2002. He has also admitted that no document or circular has been filed to show that for the appointment of sub-staff, NOC of the Employment Exchange is necessary but he has made the statement on the basis of guidelines of the Head Office but such guidelines also has not been filed. He has also admitted that there may be more than 100 vacancies of the sub-staff and the petitioner was not informed that the process of recruitment of such sub-staff did not continue due to letter issued by the Employment Exchange.

7. At the time of argument, it was submitted by the learned advocate for the workman that it is clear from the evidence on record including the documents filed by the workman that the workman was working with the Bank since the year 1989 and he also worked for 297 days preceding 12 months of the oral termination of his service on 29-10-2002, which amounts to retrenchment of the workman and provisions of Section 25-F of the Act were not complied with and due to non-compliance of the mandatory provisions the retrenchment of the workman is illegal and as such, he is entitled for reinstatement and the workman also appeared in the recruitment test conducted by the Bank and he was engaged against clear vacancy of Peon on payment monthly salary and as there are number of vacancies of sub-staff in the Bank, the workman is entitled for reinstatement and to be absorbed permanently. In support of such contention, the learned advocate for the workman placed reliance on the decisions reported in 1986 I LLJ — 127 (SC) (H. D. Singh Vs Reserved Bank of India and others), 1981 LLJ — 386 (SC) (Surendra Kumar Verma Vs CGIT), 1992, I CLR — 571 (Laxmi Pandit Vs Industrial Tribunal), 1997 II CLR 1099 (Tata Consultancy Engineers Vs V. K. Nair), 1995 I CLR — 62 (Chairman-cum-Managing Director, Orissa Road Transport Corporation Ltd. Vs Ramesh Chandra Gouda), 2003 I CLR 952 (Municipal Board Vs Labour Court) and 2008 III LLJ — 273 (T. I. Bagga Vs Maharashtra State Road Transport Corporation).

8. In reply, it was submitted by the learned advocate for the management that the specific case of the Bank is that the workman was never employed as a regular or permanent employee and by way of due process of recruitment and the workman was engaged on daily wages basis and that too for a limited period intermittently and he was being paid his remuneration by the Bank on daily wages basis on vouchers for the period of his engagement and there was no question of fixing any basic monthly salary of the workman and as such, the workman is not entitled for any relief. In support of such contention,

reliance has been placed by the learned advocate for the bank on the decisions reported in 2006 II LLJ-722 (SC) (Secretary, State of Karnataka Vs Umadevi), 1997 LIC 2075 (SC) (Himansukumar Vidyarthi Vs State of Bihar), 1996 ILLN 299 (SC) (State of Himachal Pradesh Vs Sureshkumar Verma), 2008 II LLJ - 977 (Sanjaykumar Tiwari Vs State of Bihar) and 2008 1 CLR - 908 (State of Maharashtra Vs Anil E. Kharat).

Keeping in view the principles enunciated by the Hon'ble Courts in the decisions, on which reliance has been placed by the parties, now the present case at hand is to be considered.

9. Perused the materials on record including the documents filed by the workman. Though it is the case of the Bank that the workman is not working in the Bank from 1989, the documents filed by the workman show that he worked for 15 days in 1989, 59 days in 1990, 50 days in 1991. From the documents, it is also found that the workman was engaged for 35 days from 28-6-2002 to 1-8-2002 on the basic pay of Rs.2750 alongwith Dearness Allowances and House Rent. It is also found from the documents that he was also engaged by the Bank for the period from 2-9-2002 to 29-10-2002 on the basic pay of Rs.2750 alongwith the Dearness Allowances and House Rent. It is also found from the record that he worked for 297 days, preceding 12 months from the date of his termination from service. As the workman worked for more than 240 days preceding 12 months from the date of his termination, his termination amounts to retrenchment from service and as such, it was necessary for the Bank to comply with the mandatory provisions of section 25- F of the Act and for such non-compliance of the mandatory provisions of section 25- F of the Act, the termination of the service of the workman is illegal.

10. In this case, admittedly, on 15-11-1998, the written test was conducted by the Bank for appointment of sub-staff and candidates, who were working in the Bank as daily wagers including the present workman were allowed to appear in the said examination. It is also not disputed that the workman was successful in the said test and his name was at Sl.No.1 in the list of 17 successful candidates. The only stand taken by the Bank is that there was a condition for obtaining NOC from the Employment Exchange for appointment of the successful candidate and the Employment Exchange did not provide such certificate and as such, it was not possible to take further action for appointment of the workman and the 16 others. On perusal of the call letter issued to the workman, it is found that no such condition was mentioned in the same. However, in the letter dated 13-8-1998 issued by the Bank, which has been filed by the workman, it is found that the

Zonal Manager was directed by the Chief Manager not to publish the result before obtaining of the NOC from the Employment Exchange Office, for not complying to their norms while engaging the workman temporarily. In spite of such direction, the result of the written test was published by the Bank and as such it can be presumed that either such NOC was obtained by the Bank or Bank waived the condition of obtaining the NOC. Moreover, the Bank has not filed any document to show that NOC of the Employment Exchange was required for taking further action in appointing the workman and 16 others successful candidates in the test. It is also found from the documents filed by the workman that the workman had submitted an application to the Employment Exchange Officer on 28-9-2007 for issuance of a NOC. It is also found from the documents that the Assistant Director सहायक संचालक District Employment Exchange, Nagpur gave a reply to the said letter stating that issuance of NOC by the Employment Exchange is not necessary for giving appointment to the workman and others on the basis of the test conducted by the Bank. So the said document can be treated as a NOC issued by the Employment Exchange for making appointment of the workman by the Bank. As the case of the present workman as mentioned above is quite different from the facts and circumstances of the cases referred in the decisions, on which reliance has been placed by the learned advocate for the Bank, with respect, I am of the view that those decisions have no direct implication in the present case at hand.

In view of the discussion made above and the materials on record, it is held that the termination of the service of the workman, Shri Sudarshan Laxman Chaware is not proper and justified and the workman is entitled for reinstatement in service and to be appointed as a sub-staff as per recruitment test conducted on 15-11-1998. However, the workman has neither pleaded nor adduced any evidence that he was not gainfully employed after the termination of his service, so, he is not entitled for any back wages. Hence, it is ordered:

ORDER

The reference is answered in favour of the workman in part and his termination from service by Bank is held to be not proper and justified. It is directed that the workman be reinstated in service within one month from the date of notification of the award. The workman is not entitled for any back wages. The workman is also entitled for appointment as sub-staff as per the recruitment test conducted on 15-11-1998 and as such, steps be taken by the Bank for his appointment as a sub-staff as per the result of the recruitment test conducted on 15-11-1998.

I. P. CHAND, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 18 फरवरी, 2011

का.आ. 753.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार पंजाब एंड सिंध बैंक के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय-1, चंडीगढ़ के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 293/04) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 9-2-11 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/98/2004-आई आर(बी-II)]

रमेश सिंह, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th February, 2011

S.O. 753.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 293 /04) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court-1, Chandigarh now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Punjab & Sind Bank and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 9-2-2011.

[No. L-12012/98/2004-IR (B-II)]

RAMESH SINGH, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

**BEFORE SHREE GYANENDRA KUMAR SHARMA,
PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVT.
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT-I,
CHANDIGARH**

Case No. ID 293/2004.

Raju son of Shri Sat Pal, C/o Shri Sukman Sharma, House No. 571, Sector-11B, Chandigarh

... Applicant

Versus

I. Zonal Manager, Punjab & Sind Bank, Zonal Office,
Sector 17-B, Chandigarh

... Respondent

APPEARANCES:

For the workmen : Shri Amit Sharma.

For the management : Shri J. S. Sathi

AWARD

Passed On 31-1-11

Central Govt. Ministry of Labour vide letter No. L-12012/98/2004 IR (B-II) dated 3rd of September, 2004 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the management of Punjab & Sind Bank, Chandigarh in dismissing Shri Raju,

Ex-Part time sweeper from service w.e.f. 18-9-2003 is just and legal ? If not, what relief the workman is entitled to?"

On receipt of the reference, parties were informed. Parties appeared and filed their pleadings. The case of the parties in nutshell is that on 24-10-2002, Col. S. S. Mangat husband of Smt. Gurdip Kaur submitted a complaint to the Manager, Punjab & Sind Bank, Sector-36 D, Chandigarh to the effect that on 23-10-2002, his wife withdraw Rs. 50000 from her account No. 100. During the transaction, she forget to take back the pass book and cheque book containing a blank cheque signed by his wife pertaining to her saving bank account No. 19219 in SBI, Sector-17, Chandigarh. This cheque was misappropriated and a sum of Rs. 19000 was withdrawn from her SB account in the name of one Vijay Kumar on 23-10-2002. An enquiry was conducted and it was found that workman Raju has withdrawn this amount and deposited the same in his personal account. He admitted the charges before the enquiry officer. Thereafter before this Tribunal, he challenged the voluntary nature of his admission but before this as well; he admitted withdrawal of amount in question.

Both of the parties vide order dated 21-7-2010 were given opportunity of being heard on limited issue. As the workman had admitted the charges before the enquiry officer, vide order dated 21-7-2010, opportunity was given to the workman to explain circumstances under which he deposited the cheque in his SB account. He was also afforded the opportunity to explain on quantum of punishment.

Evidence of the parties was recorded. Workman in his evidence before this Tribunal further admitted that he has withdrawn the amount and deposited the same in his SB account. The workman disclosed that he was intended to return the amount to the lawful owner and this was the reason that he had used the cheque. This contention of the workman is not trustworthy because if he was intended to return the amount; there was no occasion for him to get the cheque encashed. The workman has failed to explain as to why the cheque signed by the wife of the complainant was not returned to the manager concerned preventing himself and any other person to misuse the cheque. The act of the workman was gross misconduct and there is no doubt in proving the charge. So far as the punishment is concerned, considering the nature of misconduct which the workman has admitted, before this Tribunal as well, for me, the punishment awarded is adequate. Bank is the financial institution which requires the integrity, honesty and discipline of highest standard. There should be no compromise on the integrity, honesty and discipline. The act of the workman has rightly compelled the management to see him off the department. Accordingly, there is no merit in the present reference and the same is answered

against the workman. Central Government be informed. File be consigned.

Chandigarh.

G. K. SHARMA, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 18 फरवरी, 2011

का.आ. 754.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार इंडियन ओवरसीज बैंक के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, हैदराबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 24/2005) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 9-2-2011 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/125/2004-आई आर(बी-II)]

रमेश सिंह, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th February, 2011

S.O. 754.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 24/2005) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Hyderabad now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Indian Overseas Bank and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 9-2-2011.

[No. L-12012/125/2004-IR (B-II)]

RAMESH SINGH, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT AT HYDERABAD.

Present : Shri Ved Prakash Gaur, Presiding Officer

Dated the 11th day of January, 2011

Industrial Dispute No. 24/2005

Between :

Sri R. D. V. P. V. Sitaramanjaneyulu,
26-11/3363 (New 1685),
Simhapuri Centre, Vedayapalem,
Nellore-524004.

...Petitioner

AND

The General Manager,
Indian Overseas Bank,
Central Office, 763, Anna Salai,
Chennai-600 002.

... Respondent

APPEARANCES:

For the Petitioner : Sri. T. A. Kumar, Advocate

For the Respondent : Sri. M. V. K. Viswanadham,
Advocate

AWARD

This reference has been received from Government of India, Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. L-12012/125/2004-IR (B-II) dated 15-9-2004 under section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act. 1947 to resolve the dispute between Sri R. D. V. P. V. Sitaramanjaneyulu, ex. employee of Indian Overseas Bank and management of Indian Overseas Bank. The term of reference is as under :

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Indian Overseas Bank, Chennai in discharging the services of Sri R. D. V. P. V. Sitaramanjaneyulu, Ex-employee of Cuddapah Branch w.e.f. 11-7-2003 is legal and justified?" If not, what relief the workman is entitled to?"

The reference is numbered in this Tribunal as No. 24/2005 and notices were issued to the parties.

2. The Petitioner workman has filed claim statement stating therein that he joined Indian Overseas Bank on 18-12-1978 at its Gudur Branch Nellore District, from there he was transferred to Cuddapah Branch. He was placed under suspension, through bank's letter dated 27-12-2000 pending enquiry on the allegation that Petitioner abused used intemperate language before superiors, failed to show courtesy to his superiors and has been taking up irrelevant unwarranted matters with executives at Central Office either directly or to outside agencies in clear violation of the instructions. He was issued with the charge sheet No. PAD/IRD/184/21/2001-2002 with the allegation that he has been writing letters directly to the higher authorities abetted/instigated his wife to send letter/representations, telegrams to outside agencies regarding Petitioner's grievances in the service matters in the tone and tenor which are abusive sarcastic vilifying with intemperate insinuating/foul language and bereft of decency and decorum, covering the allegations under 17.5(b), (d), (e), (j), (1) and 17.7(j) of Bipartite settlement calling for the explanation of the Petitioner within 10 days. Petitioner submitted his explanation requesting the bank to withdrawn the charge sheet and the suspension order. Again on 16-8-2001 bank issued additional charge sheet No. PAD/IRD/184/64/2001-2002 with allegations of willful insubordination or disobedience to the lawful orders of the management which are being prejudicial to the interests of the bank under article 17.5(c) and 17.7(j) of the Bipartite settlement. One more charge sheet No. PAD/IRD/184/4/2002-2003 dated 6-5-2002 with similar imputations under same article was issued to the Petitioner. The Petitioner filed his explanation dated 13-5-2002. Enquiry was ordered. Petitioner through his letters requested the bank to permit him to avail the service of legal counsel to defend his case which was not accepted by the bank. One Sri N. Sai Prasad, was appointed as Enquiry Officer, the Petitioner moved application to avail the services of

Advocate which was declined. Petitioner moved petition before A.P.Cooperative Tribunal which was dismissed. The Petitioner was not permitted to utilize the services of Lawyer which amounts to violation of principles of natural justice. During course of enquiry Petitioner requested for adjournment of the proceeding but the same was not allowed. He has challenged the enquiry proceeding on several grounds. It was stated that basing on the prejudicial finding of the Enquiry Officer, the punishment has been imposed which is bad in law and deserves to be quashed. He has prayed that the order of discharge from service be set aside and he be reinstated in service.

3. Respondent bank has filed counter statement. It has been stated by the management that Petitioner was discharged from service with superannuation benefits i.e., Pension, PF and Gratuity. The Petitioner was in habit of willfully writing letter directly to the bank's higher authorities at Vijayawada and Visakhapatnam and top management authority of the Central office, Chennai casting aspersions on and criticizing the officials of the branch, Regional office, and Central office and the bank as a whole. The correspondence initiated by him was mostly uncalled for and unwarranted and incompatible with his position in the bank. The correspondence was found to be irrelevant, frivolous and vexatious. The tone and tenor of his letters were abusive, sarcastic with intemperate, insinuating foul language and bereft of respect, regard and politeness. The Petitioner has willfully abetted/instigated his wife Smt. R.Bharathi Devi to send letters and representations, telegrams to outside agencies regarding the grievances of the Petitioner in service matters like, transfer, punishment awarded to him and other internal functioning of the bank and thereby attempted to bring outside influence to bear upon the superiors in the bank to further Petitioner's interest. His wife Smt. R. Bharathi Devi has sent letters to President of India, Chief Justice of AP High Court, Finance Minister, Chief Vigilance Commissioner and various internal agencies regarding trivial grievances of the services of the Petitioner though she is not an employee of the bank and had no locus standi in the matter. The Petitioner made direct complaint to Regional Manager, Andhra Bank on 25-9-90 for which explanation was called for and he was advised by the Respondent to desist from repeating such actions. In spite of such caution and advises Petitioner continued to send frivolous/vexatious complaints to outside agencies and thereby committed same type of misconduct again and again. At the instance and instigation of the Petitioner one Smt. Narayanamma, sweeperess, Palamkurru branch sent complaint to the Finance Minister, Government of India, thus, the Petitioner has exploited the ignorance/innocence of illiterate sweeperess and he mislead, misguided and obtaining her signature on her complaint drafted by him and typed at his instance without revealing

to her the contents/meaning of the complaint. He was chargesheeted regarding receiving of the complaint from said Smt. Narayanamma on 24-2-1997 and he was awarded with punishment of reduction in basic pay by three stages. There was clear instruction from the central office of bank by different circular letters with a staff number of all the levels not to make representation directly to the General Manager/Executive Director/ Chairman and Managing Director to route all such correspondence through proper channel. But Petitioner continued to send letter directly to top executives and outside agencies. He was suspended on 27-12-2000 and chargesheeted on 21-5-2001.

4. The following charges were levelled against him:

- i. You are in the habit of willfully writing letters directly to bank's higher authorities at Regional Office, Vijayawada and top management at Central Office, Chennai casting aspersions on and criticizing the officials of the Branch, Regional Office and Central Office and the bank as a whole. For example your letter dated 3-6-2000 addressed and sent directly to our General Manager, Personnel Administration Department, Central Office, Chennai. You continued to address letter dated 2-1-2001 and 8-3-2011 addressed and sent directly to our Bank's Chairman and Managing Director and letter dated 6-1-2001 addressed and sent directly to our Assistant General Manager, Industrial Relations Department Central Office.
- ii. The correspondence initiated by you as above quite frequently are uncalled for and unwarranted and incompatible with your position in the bank. Your correspondence was found to be irrelevant/frivolous and vexatious. The tone and tenor of your letters were abusive, sarcastic, insinuating, with intemperate/foul language and bereft of respect, regard and politeness.
- iii. You were in the habit of willfully sending the letters/representations frequently and directly to our Bank's Chairman & Managing Director/General Manager/Executives at Central office regarding your grievances in service matters without routing the same through proper channel despite clear instructions of bank to desist from such acts.
- iv. You have also willfully abetted/instigated your wife Smt. R. Bharathi Devi to send letters/representations/telegrams directly to outside agencies regarding your grievances in service matters like transfer, punishment awarded to you and other internal matters of the bank and thereby attempted to bring outside influence to bear upon the superiors in the bank to further your interest.

- v. You have also willfully abetted/instigated your wife Smt. R. Bharathi Devi to send letters/representation/telegrams to the President of India, Chief Justice of AP High Court, Finance Minister, Government of India, Chief Vigilance Commissioner and lodge complaints to various internal agencies regarding your trivial grievances in service matters and the internal functioning of the bank, when she, as a non employee of the bank had no locus standi in the matter.
- vi. The tone tenor of the correspondence emanated from your wife Smt. R. Bharathi Devi are abusive, sarcastic, vilifying with intemperate/insinuating/foul language and bereft of decency and decorum. Further these correspondence tend to mar and tarnish the image of the bank, our executives and our employees.
- vii. You had willfully abetted/instigated your wife Smt. R. Bharathi Devi to send fax dated 10-12-2000 directly to the Chairman and Managing Director, which is abusive, sarcastic with intemperate/insinuating language, bereft of respect and regard. Despite the Bank having advised your wife specifically not to write such communications, you had continued to adopt instigate her to do so.
- viii. In spite of your declaration of fidelity and secrecy to the Bank at the time of your joining that you will not communicate or allow to be communicated to any person not legally entitled there to any information relating to the affairs of any person having any dealing with our bank, you had divulged disclosed information to persons not entitled to the same, your wife has enclosed documents in her correspondence which are privy to the bank.
- ix. you are in the habit of directly corresponding with Executives at Central Office. You have failed to comply with the instructions contained in the circulars EST 117/86 dated 3-11-86, 7(f) 123 dated 18-8-89 and 7(f) dated 23-7-90.
- x. Despite Industrial Relations Department, Central Office, caution letter dated 16-7-91 to you, Regional Office, Vijayawada letters dated 4-1-00 and 13-1-00 and caution letter dated 9-8-00 to you and the earlier charge sheet dated 24-2-97 and punishment order dated 25-5-99 to you thereon for similar misconduct, you have not shown any improvement but continued to repeat the misconduct.

5. The Petitioner has contended in his explanation that in opinion of the general public, superiors, executives are expected to discharge their duties and responsibilities without nepotism and favouritism. By virtue of one's own decisions/actions only, the superiority and respectability is estimated and as far as the bank is concerned the activities and decisions are being observed by the staff

and create an impression about the superiors and executives. He has referred the Thomsons Court Affidavit and violation of Bipartite Settlement, systems and procedures in awarding punishments transfer to Cuddapah, cancellation transfer order to Nellore and present suspension order violating the guidelines issued by Central Administrative Tribunals/Courts. The Petitioner has been charge sheeted several times, he submitted his explanation dated 13-5-2002 in the same way. The Enquiry Officer has followed the principles of natural justice and has given full and fair opportunity to the Petitioner. Enquiry Officer has submitted his report with cogent reasons basing on the evidence placed before him. No prejudice has been caused to the Petitioner workman. He has not been able to prove any prejudice. The claim petition is devoid of merit and deserves to be dismissed.

6. Parties were directed to file their respective evidence. Petitioner workman has filed as many as 18 documents as per list which consists of Order PAID IRD-184/191/2000-2001 of the Respondent suspending Petitioner, chargesheet issued, explanation to charge sheet, additional charge sheet dated 16-8-2001, explanation to charge sheet, 3rd charge sheet dated 6-5-2002, explanation to 3rd charge sheet, representation of Petitioner to engage lawyer dated 4-12-2001, reply to representation rejecting the request by Respondent, orders of Hon'ble High Court of A. P., in WP No. 26075 2001, dated 23-4-2002, enquiry proceedings 27-11-2002, written brief submitted by Petitioner to Enquiry Officer, show cause notice dated 3-5-2003 by Respondent to Petitioner, Reply of the Petitioner dated 4-6-2003, removal order dated 12-7-2003, appeal of Petitioner against removal order dated 31-8-2003, representation of Petitioner to Chairman of the Bank dated 14-11-2003, order of Appellate Authority confirming the punishment dated 17-12-2003. He has also filed his affidavit in support of his claim statement. Management has filed enquiry proceeding book containing enquiry proceeding in 19 pages, enquiry report in 22 pages, enquiry notice to the Petitioner etc. and the Petitioner's D. O. letters, Petitioner's letters to Chairman etc.

7. In this matter since domestic enquiry was conducted by the management before imposition of the punishment on the Petitioner workman hence, the question of legality and validity of domestic enquiry was considered before hearing the parties under Sec. 11A of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. My Learned Predecessor vide his order dated 21-11-2006 held that domestic enquiry conducted by the management was valid and legal and posted the case for argument under Sec. 11A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

8. I have heard both the counsels. They have filed their written arguments as well. I have gone through the written arguments. This tribunal has to consider following points in the present case :

(I) Whether the action of management of Indian Overseas Bank, in discharging the services of Sri R.D.V.P.V. Seetharamanjaneyulu is legal and justified

(II) If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?

9. Point No. (I): It is undisputed fact between the parties that Petitioner was appointed in the management bank as back as on 18-12-1978 as typist and was transferred to Nellore branch in 1991. Thereafter he was transferred to Cuddapah branch. He was placed under suspension through letter dated 27-12-2000 on the allegation that Petitioner abused/used intemperate language against superiors, he has been taking up irrelevant and unwarranted matters with executives of central office directly and to outside agencies inspite of clear instructions of the bank that no direct communications has to be made to the superiors but through the proper channel. It has been alleged that Petitioner has made several complaints to his superiors and central office directly. He instigated and abetted his wife to make complaints to outside agencies in the matter of transfer, posting and punishment awarded to the Petitioner workman using derogatory and abusive language to the superiors, his wife made complaints to the superior officers and also to Government of India, Finance Minister, Chief Justice of A.P. High Court in clear violation of para 17.5 (B), (D), (E), (J) and 17.7(j) of Bipartite Settlement. The Petitioner contended that an employee subjected to unfair treatment and harassment can represent/appeal to higher authorities about the grievances or objectionable actions on part of his immediate superiors and the Petitioner workman has done all in conformity with the provisions of the award. The Petitioner alleged that he has not acted illegally and his action can not be brought under the provisions of the bipartite settlement and no disciplinary proceedings should have been initiated against him nor he could have been punished by the management. He has cited the provisions of para 17.5(b), 17.5(d), 17.5(c), 17.5(e) and 17.5 (j). The Learned Counsel for the Petitioner workman has argued before this tribunal that even if it is assumed that Petitioner has made complaint to the superiors or outside agencies, that the wife of the Petitioner has made complaint to the superiors of the Petitioner and outside agencies the action of his wife can not be termed as misconduct on the part of the Petitioner. As against this argument of the Learned Counsel of the Petitioner the Learned Counsel for the Respondent has argued that under article 17.5(c) of the bipartite settlement, "a willfull insubordination or disobedience of any lawful reasonable order of the management or of a superior" or is a misconduct. Again "abetment or instigation of the any of the above acts or omissions as mentioned above" is a misconduct. Under clause 17.7(j) "failing to show proper consideration, courtesy or attention towards officers customers or their employees of bank unseemly or

unsatisfactory behaviour while on duty" is also termed as misconduct. A charge sheet was issued to the Petitioner workman calling for his explanation, though he submitted his explanation it was not found to be satisfactory hence, enquiry was ordered and conducted in which the Petitioner has taken part and after completion of the enquiry, Enquiry Officer has held that the charges levelled against the Petitioner were proved hence, the Petitioner was discharged from service with superannuation, benefits. Thus, no prejudice was caused to the Petitioner workman. The Petitioner workman has been in the habit of making false and frivolous complaints to the extent of casting aspersions on of his superiors, his wife Smt. R. Bharathi Devi sent telegram regarding the character of female superiors which was a concocted story, the wife of Petitioner has no concern with the bank internal matters or the working of the bank. There are several letters which were produced before the Enquiry Officer to show that Petitioner himself has made several direct communications in violation of the standing orders and circular letters of the bank that no bank employee will make direct communication with the superior authorities. All these charges were proved during the enquiry proceeding, as such, the Petitioner workman can not alleged that prejudice has been caused to him during the course of enquiry.

10. Against this, Learned Counsel for the Petitioner workman has argued that in the present case the enquiry itself was illegally conducted because, the Enquiry Officer has acted as Presenting Officer himself. Meaning thereby, the Enquiry Officer has acted as a Prosecutor and as well as a Judge, thus, the entire enquiry proceeding is vitiated and the finding given by the Enquiry Officer on the basis of such an illegal enquiry is illegal, baseless and can not be looked into for imposing the punishment on the Petitioner workman.

11. Against this argument, the Learned Counsel for the Respondent has argued that at present the matter is pending consideration under Sec.11 A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The question of legality and validity of the enquiry proceeding has already been considered by Learned Previous Presiding Officer of this tribunal and he has already held the enquiry proceeding to be legal and valid, as such, this tribunal can not look into the legality or otherwise of the domestic enquiry proceeding because this tribunal is not an Appellate Authority to the order passed by its Predecessor.

12. I have considered this argument of the Learned Counsels for the parties and I am also of the considered view that once my Learned Predecessor has decided the question of legality and validity of the domestic enquiry, this tribunal at this stage has no right and authority to look into the legality and validity of the domestic enquiry because this tribunal is not an Appellate Authority to the order passed by its own Predecessor, as such, the order passed by my Learned Predecessor on 21-11-2006 can not

be re-appreciated or reviewed by this tribunal and it will be considered as part of this Award.

13. This tribunal has to consider as to whether the action of the management is legal or not. The Petitioner workman himself has stated in the claim statement that he has made representations to the superior authorities as per the provisions of Para 5 and 7 of Sastri Award, but, he has not been able to prove that when there is ban not to make direct communication to the superior authority under which provision he has made direct communication to his superior authority without following the procedure to make representation through proper channel and what made his wife to make complaints against officials of the bank who is not concerned with the matter of the bank. This amply prove that the Petitioner workman has violated the provisions of para 17.5(b) 17.5(d), 17.5 (c) 17.5(e) 17.5(i) and 17.7(j) and the bank management has simply discharged the workman with superannuation benefit as such, no prejudice has been caused. The action of the management is neither illegal no unjustified. Point No.(I) is decided accordingly.

14. Point No. (II): As the action of the management is neither illegal nor unjustified, the Petitioner has been awarded superannuation benefits, as such, he is not entitled for any relief and petition deserves to be dismissed. The reference is answered accordingly, hence this Award.

Award passed accordingly. Transmit.

Dictated to Smt. P. Phani Gowri, Personal Assistant transcribed by her corrected by me on this the 11th day of January, 2011.

VED PRAKASH GAUR, Presiding Officer

Appendix of evidence

Witnesses examined for the Petitioner	Witnesses examined for the Respondent
--	--

NIL

NIL

Documents marked for the Petitioner

NIL

Documents marked for the Respondent

NIL

नई दिल्ली, 17 फरवरी, 2011

का.आ. 755.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मैसर्स डाल्मिया मैग्नीसाइड कॉरपोरेशन सलेम-5 के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, चेन्नई के पंचाट

(संदर्भ संख्या 10/1971) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 17-2-2011 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. 12(36)/70-एल आर IV]

रमेश सिंह, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 17th February, 2011

S.O. 755.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 10/1971) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Chennai now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. Dalmia Magnesite Corporation Salem-5 and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 17-2-2011.

[No. 12(36)/70-LR IV]

RAMESH SINGH, Desk Officer

ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL TAMILNADU, CHENNAI-600 104

Friday, 10th Day of October, 2008

Present :

Thiru A. Arumugasamy, BA. M. L.,

Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal

Industrial Dispute No. 10 of 1971

(In the matter of dispute for adjudication Under Sec. 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 between the Workmen and the Management of Dalmia Magnesite Corporation, Salem-5).

The Workmen represented by

The General Secretary,

Salem Distt. Magnesite Labour Union,

Suramangalam,

Salem-5.

...Petitioner Union

AND

M/s Dalmia Magnesite Corporation,

Salem-5,

...Respondent/Management

Reference : Order No. 12(36)/70-LR IV Dated 22-1-1971, Ministry of Labour, Govt. of India, New Delhi.

This dispute coming on for final hearing on Monday, the 29th day of September, 2008, upon hearing the arguments of M/s. Row & Reddy, Advocates appearing for Petitioner Union No. 1 and Petitioner Nos. 2 & 3 are already dismissed and M/s. T. Poornam and P. Vivek, Advocates appearing for the Respondent/management and upon perusing the Reference, Claim statement, Counter statement and other connected papers on record in this industrial dispute, and this dispute having stood over till

this day for consideration, this Tribunal made the following :

AWARD

The Government of India have referred the following issue for adjudication by this Tribunal :

"Whether the employees of Dalmia Magnesite Corporation, Salem, are entitled to payment for rest day and if so what should be their Sunday wages?"

2. The main averments found in the Claim statement of the Petitioner/union are as follows :

The Dalmia Magnesite Corporation Employees Union is a registered Trade Union under the Indian Trade Unions Act 1926 and it commands a substantial membership of workers employed in the Respondent/management. The Workmen of the Respondent/management who are members of this union have raised an Industrial dispute in which they have demanded that all the workers must be paid wages for the rest day viz. Sundays also, at the usual rates. The above said Management of Dalmia Magnesite Corporation which is engaged in elaborate mining operations and producing Dead Burnt Magnesite in this District of Salem. The Management is owning a big factory at Salem and there are nearly 800 workers who are employed directly by the Management and all these 800 workers are directly involved and covered in this presence reference. The Management factory at Salem is working for six days in a week and Sunday is the day of weekly rest for these workers. The workers are daily rated and their wages under daily rates are not fixed with reference to a month of 26 working days. Ever since the inception of the factory the workers are only daily rated and they are paid only for six days in a week and their monthly income is not determined on the basis of a month consisting of 26 working days. The wage dispute raised by the workers of this factory was referred for adjudication by the Industrial Tribunal, Madras and an award was passed by the Industrial Tribunal on 26-9-1968. Even in that award the rates of wages were not fixed with reference to a month of 26 working days. On the other hand, the Industrial Tribunal Madras, on the other words, fixed the wages only for 26 working days leaving out the days of rest viz., Sundays. it is pertinent to state that the Management in the case of deducting the worker's salary for loss of pay for a day, calculates one day's wages by dividing the total monthly wages by 26 days. This would clearly show that the wages fixed by this Tribunal are not on the basis of a month consisting of 26 working days, but only for 26 working days in a month. The Management has been paying the employees in the staff category for all the 30 days in a month, including the rest day viz. Sundays. There is no justification for the management to refuse or deny the workers their legitimate wages for the rest day also i.e. Sunday. This union reiterates that whenever a worker enters into a contract of service for wages with any

employer, the contract is for the effect that the worker should work as directed by the employer and the employer in turn is bound to pay the workers for all the 30 days in a month, without any discrimination between different categories of workers employed and the same treatment in the matter of payment of wages, for all the 30 days in a month. The Factories Act came into force and that being the Labour Welfare Legislation, stipulated a statutory obligation on every employer to pay one day rest to his workers in a week, i.e. The rest day and after coming into force of the Factories Act, the worker is required to work only for six days in a week, but at the same time, he should also be given his salary for all the 7 days in a week, inclusive of the rest day. This being the clear position, the Management is not justified in denying the payment of the workers wages for the rest day also, i.e. Sunday. As stated earlier, it is not the case here that the wages paid to these workers are fixed with reference to a month of 26 working day. It is needed to state that the workers have got to maintain themselves even on the rest days, as it is crystal clear, and the wages paid to them for six days are hardly sufficient for meeting their maintainance on rest days also. The Union point out that the Management is a well-established concern with substantial profit earnings every year. The Management commands the financial capacity to meet this just demand. The additional monthly commitment in this regard will not be more than Rs. 10000 and the management can easily bear this without any financial strain. The workmen have been demanding the wages for the rest day also (Sunday) from the year 1966 onwards and the demand of the workers is fully justified and the workers who are mostly unskilled are getting only very low wages of Rs. 3.75 per day, which will not enable them to meet their sustenance expenses for the rest days of Sundays. Therefore it is prayed that this Tribunal may be pleased to pass an award granting wages for each rest day from the beginning of 1970 at their usual daily wages inclusive of dearness allowance and other allowances and thus render justice.

3. The main averments found in the Counter statement of the Respondent/management are as follows :

The Respondent Management is carrying on the business mining of magnesite and manufacture of Dead Burnt Magnesite employing about 800 workers directly, who are covered by the present reference besides some independent contractors and other staff. The allegations in the claim statement filed by the three unions that the workmen are paid wages only for 6 days they work in the week and not for the weekly day of rest is not correct. The rates of wages for daily rated workmen have been fixed after making due provision for the fact that no wages, as such, are payable for the weekly day of rest. The present rates of wages for the workers have been fixed by the Industrial Tribunal, Madras in the Award in I.D. 39 of 1966

after taking into account all the relevant factors. The rates of wages, prevailing before the Award was passed, were fixed by dividing the monthly wages by the number of working days 26 or 25, as the case may be and hence tribunal correctly calculated the monthly wages by multiplying the daily rate of wages by the number of working days only. The rates of wages prevailing prior to the passing of the Award were also by negotiations and settlement with the Unions. The union's contention that the fact that for calculating one days' wages for loss of pay, the total monthly wages are divided by 26 days shows that the wages fixed are not on the basis of a month consisting, of 26 working days but only for 26 working days in a month, is not correct. The daily wages having been calculated on the basis of dividing the monthly wages by the number of working days 26 or 25, it necessarily follows that, in calculating the loss of pay for any one working day on which the worker is absent, the same basis has to be adopted. As stated above wages payable for 30 days, were divided by 26 days to arrive at the daily rates of wages. Moreover, the claim for payment for the seventh day will amount to payment twice for the rest day as the daily wages includes the payment for the seventh day also. As stated above, the daily rates of wages fixed by the management and then by the Tribunal includes the wages for the, weekly day of rest also and the unions' demand for a separate wage for the weekly day or rest amounts only to a claim for increase in the wages, for which they have already raised a separate demand and the same is pending before the Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) Madras and cannot be considered under the present reference. The statement contained in para 4 of the claim statement of the Salem District Magnesite Labour Union, viz. That M/s. Burn and Co., Limited and M/s. Salem Magnesite Private Limited pay a day's wages as good attendance bonus to their workmen who attend work for 6 days in the week and that the wages paid by these two companies are better than the wages paid by the Respondent/Management is not correct. The rates of wages fixed by the Industrial Tribunal in the Award in I.D. 39 of 1966 referred to above are applicable to all the three companies. The said Tribunal has in the same Award directed that the attendance bonus already in force in M/s. Burn and Company Limited, and M/s. Salem Magnesite (Private) Limited, should continue and observed that it is not necessary to extend such a benefit to the workers in M/s. Dalmia Magnesite Corporation. M/s. Burn and Company Ltd., and M/s. Salem Magnesite (Private) Limited are extending a sort of incentive to their workers for regular attendance for reasons of their own. The tribunal in the earlier award had considered the question and held that such allowance need not be paid in the Respondent's establishment. From the order of reference it can be seen that a claim for incentive by way of good attendance bonus which is a separate issue altogether, is not the subject matter of the reference in this dispute.

The statement contained para 8 of the claim statement of the Salem District Magnesite Labour union that the management originally agreed to grant wages for the rest day, but for reasons best known to them, they resiled from it and preferred to have the matter decided on a joint reference, is not correct. On the other hand, the Management pointed out to the three unions that besides the fact that the daily rates of wages duly take care of the wages for the weekly day of rest; as the provisions of the Minimum Wages Act have been extended to the Magnesite Industry, in case the existing rates of wages, the same will be raised and that therefore, there was no justification to press the demand for payment of wages for the weekly day of rest. The Respondent company denies the allegation in the claim statement that the financial burden on the management, as a result of the demand under reference being conceded, is only small and the management is capable of meeting the same. In the event of payment of wages for the rest day separately being ordered which according to the respondent is taken into account while fixing the daily wages, the liability of the Respondent company will increase not only in the payment of their total wage will increase not only in the payment of their total wage bill but also in other respects as well as P.F. Bonus, Leave pay etc. The Respondent denies the allegation that there has been discrimination between the 'staff and workmen'. Without prejudice to the above contentions the Respondent company submits that in any event, the workmen are not entitled to payment of wages on a rest day, as no statutory obligation in cast on the employer to pay wages for the weekly day of rest. In any event there are no circumstances to give effect to the award from 1970 or any such earlier date as claimed. In the above circumstances, the Respondent prays that this tribunal may be pleased to answer the reference in favour of the Respondent with costs.

4. **Point :** The Point for consideration is whether the employees of Dalmia Magnesite Corporation, Salem are entitled to payment for the rest days and if so, what should be their Sunday wages.

5. On behalf of Petitioner/union WW1 Thiru A. Perithambi has been examined and MW1 Thiru A. R. Ganesar has been examined and Exs. M1 to M4 and Ex. C1 were marked before the order of the remand. After remand, MW2 Thiru S. Veeraraghavan has been examined and Exs. M5 to M18 were marked.

6. It is not in dispute that on 30-10-1971 an award was passed at first instance. Thereafter, the management filed a Writ Petition No. 476/1972 against that award was filed and it was dismissed. Thereafter, Writ Appeal No. 90/1976 filed by the Management was allowed on 6-7-1978. Thereafter, once again another award was passed on 2-11-79 and thereafter, one day wages was given from 1-1-1971 onwards. Thereafter, the Management filed a Writ Petition No. 235/1980, in that Writ petition on the undertaking the workers were getting their amounts.

Against the Orders of W. P. No. 235/1980, again the Respondent/management filed Writ Appeal No. 183/80 and the same was remanded back directing to answer the following issues :

- (1) Whether the wages paid to the workmen by the Management before and after the award in I.D. No. 39 of 1966 include the rest day wages as well as alleged by the Management?
- (2) If the wages already paid do not indirectly include the rest day wages, whether the workmen are entitled to be paid separately rest day wages and if so, what is the rate for the period prior to 24-2-1979?
- (3) For the period subsequent to 24-2-1979 whether the petitioner-Management is paying wages higher than the wages notified under the Minimum Wages Act and if so, whether the workmen are entitled to separate payment of rest day wages in addition to their usual wages ?

7. After remand, no witness was examined on the side of the Workers, MW2 Thiru S. Veeraraghavan claiming as General Manager has been examined and Exs. M5 to M18 were marked. In his evidence he would say that the rest day wages has already been included in the wages. According to the Petitioner during the cross examination of MW2, he has admitted that the leave wages has not been included. Therefore the issues have to be answered accordingly.

8. During the Cross examination of MW 2, he has deposed as follows :

"[1971] விருந்து தொழிலாளர்களுக்கு தினக்கூலி கொடுத்ததோடு மட்டுமே... நாட்கள் ஈரத்திற்கு 6 நாட்கள் வேலை செய்தால் 6 நாட்கள் கூலி கொடுப்போம்... 7வதுநாள் விடுமுறை கொடுப்போம்... 20 நாட்கள் தொழிலாளர்கள் வேலை செய்தால் 20 நாள் சம்பளம் கொடுப்பேன் என்றால் சரி. 26 நாட்கள் சம்பளம் கொடுப்பதில் என்றால் 30 நாட்கள் சம்பளத்தினை கணக்கிட்டு 26 நாட்களுக்கு கொடுப்போம்... ஆனால் நான் கிட்டாய் சொல்வதற்கு ஆதாரம் நாங்கள் இல்லை."

Therefore from this it is very clear that they have paid daily wages only for the days they worked. Their emoluments have not included the rest day wages.

9. According to the contention of the Respondent/Management, even in the Ex. C1 Award it discloses that 30 days salary has been divided and paid to the worker for 26 working days. Therefore, Rest day wages already included in the wages for which he relied on the Award dated 27-9-1968 in para 63, it runs as follows :

"Dearness allowance has to be increased when the cost of living index moves up so as to protect the real

earnings of the employees from being eroded. It may be useful and necessary first to fix the dearness allowance upto 460 points and then to determine the dearness allowance. At present, the dearness allowance varies from 0-50 paise per day to 1.99 per day of Rs. 13 to Rs. 52.75. This is due to splitting up of the wage structure as per agreement of 1960 (Ex. M 51) as well as giving increment as per agreement of 1962 (Ex. M 57). Fixing the dearness allowance upto 460 points at Rs. 30 per month and calculation is made having regard to the increase in the cost of living index, there will be an increase of roughly Rs. 1.16 per day in the dearness allowance as per the method of calculation indicated below."

10. The Petitioner/union relied on the same award in para 62 it runs as follows :

"To arrive at monthly wages, the above daily wages shall be multiplied by 26, the number representing the number of working days in a month. Similarly, the increment per month should be calculated and the two sums totalled to arrive at total monthly wages of the different categories of workmen."

11. While reading the para 62 of the above said award, daily wages have been given to the workers and it has been calculated by 26 days not by 30 days. While reading para 63 of the same award as pointed out by the management, the Dearness Allowance has been fixed for a month in that paragraph. While reading the para 63, it is clear that Rs. 30 as Dearness allowance has been fixed for a month and it has been divided by 26 days and one day Dearness allowance has been arrived at Rs. 1.16 p. On showing of para 62 the contention of the petitioner is that the rest day wages has not been included. On showing the para 63, the contention of the Respondent/management is that Rest day wages must have been included in that paragraph that is the reason in the award. Dearness allowance of Rs. 30 has been divided by 26 working days.

12. I am of the view, that at the time of calculating the wages, the daily wages for 26 days alone has been calculated and not for 30 days. Since it is not in the award, one cannot imagine and substitute that at the time of calculating the wages 30 days salary has been taken and it has been divided by 26 days and daily wages has been fixed only by applying the formula. On reading the award, I am of the view that daily wages alone has been fixed in that award which does not include the Rest day wages. Of course, Dearness Allowance has been calculated for 30 days and then divided by 26 days. Further there is no specific evidence on both sides to show that what was the method of calculation of wages prevailing in the area or nearby factories at that time also not available. With these observations, I hold that the Issue Nos. 1 & 2 in favour of the petitioner holding that the wages paid to the workmen by the management did not include the 'Rest day wages'. Therefore, the workers are entitled for Rest day wages prior

to 24-2-79 as noted in Para 62 of EX. C I Award dated 27-9-68. I hold that the Issue Nos. 1 & 2 in favour of the petitioners and against the Respondent.

13. Issue No.3 : The Counsel appearing for the Management contended that after 24-2-79, the management is paying higher than the statutory amount, hence the workers are not entitled for any amount thereafter.

14. The Counsel appearing for the Petitioner contended that the Minimum wages is a basic wages and it will not debar the Court to fix the amount. Hence the wages may be fixed accordingly.

15. In an earlier two issues I have decided that the workers are entitled for Rest day wages' upto 24-2-1979. Thereafter, Minimum Wages Act was passed and it has been complied by the Respondent. Admittedly, the Petitioner were receiving their higher emoluments than the amount fixed in the Minimum Wages Act. Therefore, subsequent to 1979 the question of leave wages does not arise. I am answering the issue against the Petitioners and in favour of the Respondent/Management.

In the result, award is passed holding that the employees of Dalmia Magnesite Corporation, Salem, are entitled to payment of rest days wages upto 24-2-1979. No costs.

Dated at Chennai, this 10th day of October, 2008.

THIRU A. ARUMUGASAMY, Presiding Officer

ID No. 10/1971

List of Witnesses Exhibits

Witnesses Examined on the Side of Petitioner/
Workmen :

W. W. 1 : Thiru. A. Periaihambi

Witnesses Examined on the Side of Respondent/
Management

M. W. 1 : Thiru. A. R. Ganesan

M. W. 2 : Thiru. S. Veeraraghavan

Exhibits Marked on the Side of Tribunal :

S. No.	Date	Description of Document
1	01/07/70	Ex.C01 Notification of Government of India

Respondent/Management

S. No.	Date	Description of Document
1	2	3
1	27-9-68	Ex. M01 Award in I.D. No. 39/66 & 71/66

1	2	3
2.	12-5-71	Ex.M02 Gazette publishing Labour Employment in Magnesite mines ordered to part 1 of schedule to minimum wages
3.	08-07-71	Ex.M03 Statement showing wages paid to workmen by the management and other 3 magnesite companies
4.	27-03-78	Ex.M01 Notification of the Central Govt. regarding fixation of minimum rates of wages to the employees in magnesite mines.
5.	04-12-76	Ex.M05 DIR Notification
6.	13-01-77	Ex.M06 Settlement
7.	04-06-77	Ex.M07 Settlement
8.	09-02-79	Ex.M08 Copy of the Notification No S.O. 740
9.		Ex.M09 Statement showing wages paid by respondent Feb 1979 to April 2008
10.	09-09-80	Ex.M10 Statement for the period from 01-04-80 to 31-03-83
11.	05-07-83	Ex.M11 Settlement for the period from 01-04-83 to 31-03-86
12.	19-08-85	Ex.M12 Settlement for the period from 1-04-86 to 30-11-86
13.	17-08-87	Ex.M13 Settlement for the period from 1-12-86 to 30-11-89
14.	19-10-90	Ex.M14 Settlement for the period from 1-12-89 to 30-11-93
15.	14-05-89	Ex.M15 Settlement for the period from 01-12-93 to 30-11-97
16.	31-03-98	Ex.M16 Settlement for the period from 1-12-97 to 30-11-2001
17.	28-01-04	Ex.M17 Settlement for the period from 01-01-04 to 31-12-06
18.	14-02-07	Ex.M18 Settlement for the period from 01-01-07 to 31-12-09

नई दिल्ली, 21 फरवरी, 2011

का.आ. 756.—केन्द्रीय सरकार संतुष्ट है कि लोकहित में ऐसा अपेक्षित है कि करेसी नोट प्रेस, नासिक रोड में सेवाओं को जिनके औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की प्रथम अनुसूची की प्रविष्टि 25 के अन्तर्गत निर्दिष्ट किया गया है, उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिए लोक उपयोगी सेवाएं घोषित किया जाना चाहिए।

अतः अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 2 के खण्ड (द) के उप-खण्ड (6) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त उद्योग को उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिए तत्काल प्रभाव से छः मास की कालावधि के लिए लोक उपयोगी सेवा घोषित करती है।

[सं. एस-11017/2/2006-आईआर (पीएल)]

रवि माथुर, अपर सचिव

New Delhi, the 21st February, 2011

S.O. 756.—Whereas the Central Government is satisfied that the public interest required that the services

in the Currency Note Press, Nashik Road which is covered by item 25 of the First Schedule to the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), should be declared to be a Public Utility Service for the purposes of the said Act.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-clause (vi) of clause (n) of section 2 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Central Government hereby declares with immediate effect the said industry to be a Public Utility Service for the purpose of the said Act for a period of six months.

[No. S-11017/2/2006-IR (PL)]

RAVI MATHUR, Addl. Secy.